Alberta Capital Region Governance Review

Study of Regional Growth Management Options
(Revised)
November 2000

Lara Pinchbeck
Rhonda Lothammer
Box 52165
Edmonton, AB T6G 2T5
780 434 5817
lpinchbeck@yahoo.com

103-01892/

Table of Contents

Summary i

Purpose of this Report 1

Growth Management – An Introduction 1

How Growth Management Developed 2

What is Growth Management? 7

Building a Growth Management Framework 10

Common Considerations 12

Growth Management Strategies 13

Growth Management Case Studies – A Comparison 17
- Case Study #1 - Halifax, Nova Scotia 18
- Case Study #2 - Okotoks, Alberta 21

Dealing with the Neighbours 25
- Case Study #3 - Atlanta, Georgia 26
- Case Study #4 - Portland, Oregon 35
- Case Study #5 – Victoria, B.C. 39
- Case Study #6 – The State of Minnesota 47

Appendix A – Expert Interviews 51
- Curtis Johnson 51
- Doug Porter 55
- Dr. Allan Wallis 58

Appendix B – Case Study Interviews 65
- Katherine Graham 65
- Ken Meech 68
- Will Pearce 70

Appendix C – Alberta Capital Region Background 74

Appendix D – Capital Region Background Interviews 76
- Alberta Capital Region Alliance 76
- Town of Devon 76
- City of Edmonton 79
- City of Fort Saskatchewan 82
- County of Leduc 88
- Municipal Affairs – Alberta Provincial Government 94
- River Valley Alliance 97
- City of Spruce Grove 98
- County of Strathcona 102
- City of St. Albert 107
- George Cuff 110

Summary

Abstract

This paper is intended to guide decision makers as they explore concepts for managing growth that exist within a spectrum. Decisions makers may choose one based on the outcome they desire for their community and on the process that supports the realization of that vision.

What is Growth Management?

Growth Management is a process by which municipalities gain the benefits of growth while minimizing the problems. It is based upon a commitment to the future quality of life.

Growth Management is a shared commitment to a vision of the future of a region, combined with guidelines and actions to ensure that the vision is achieved. In some cases, guidelines or controls have been imposed, but this paper suggests a "bottom up" approach.

Growth Management is a model that allows municipalities to take responsibility for a number of growth related issues that might have previously been outside of their scope. It strives not just to manage growth but to envision it. Municipalities are challenged to establish a vision and a set of principles to help guide them as they determine future directions for planning and development in their region.

Maintaining Community Identity and Managing Costs

Municipalities strive for a strong community identity and healthy quality of life delivered in a cost efficient manner. But as they experience increased economic prosperity, municipalities are also experiencing escalating public costs and a reduction in controllables. This leaves decision makers with fewer options. Smart Growth provides options to promote a community's vision and choices for making informed and directed decisions.

Although many citizens desire economic success for their region and growth in their jobs, they do not want this at the expense of the environment and their community. Smart Growth can help strengthen communities, preserve the environment, and ensure economic competitiveness. "The more variety, the more diversity, the more growing and living things in an ecosystem, the more resilient it is to misfortune. I see economic development as a form of natural development. It follows the same rules." (Jane Jacobs, *The Nature of Economics*, 2000).

Evolution of Growth Strategies

Growth Strategies have evolved from dealing with a single issue to recognizing that growth needs to be addressed through a multijurisdictional inclusive and collaborative decision making process that balances environmental responsibility, economic prosperity, and social equity issues. In the middle of this progression are practices centered around the management, regulation, and direction of growth concentrating on its amount, rate, location, and quality.

Building a Growth Management Framework

Those citizens who are concerned about unchecked growth are usually willing to help set up a framework for and of their region. Support for Growth Management will increase with the inclusion of a diversity of voices.

Growth Management frameworks can be developed through the following cycle: establishing a philosophical position (vision and principles), creating a structure that encompasses this position, developing indicators that will provide feedback on the direction and success of the framework, and modifying the framework accordingly to ensure compliance with the principles.

Vision
The vision is a statement that defines the quality of life of a community. It recognizes the connection between development and quality of life and identifies sense of place and its characteristics. The vision helps establish a set of principles that become a reference for the decision making process.

Principles
When stakeholders develop Growth Management principles they often consider:
1. strengthening and directing development toward existing communities
2. preserving open space, agricultural land, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
3. mixing land uses at a pedestrian scale
4. taking advantage of compact building design
5. creating walkable neighbourhoods
6. creating housing choices that are affordable
7. fostering distinctive attractive communities with a strong sense of place
8. providing a variety of transportation choices
9. encouraging community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions
10. making development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective

Principles developed become the framework for the decision making process. They help guide the process through fluctuating growth cycles to ensure decisions are not made under pressure but are made consistently over the long term.

Indicators
Indicators - the mechanisms to measure the success of the principles -should be developed in conjunction with the principles.

Decision making Process
Involving a broad based stakeholder group in this process allows them to exercise their rights and keeps them accountable for their actions. If a particular interest group supports a particular action they will need to understand and justify to the region the consequences of that action. By involving stakeholders capacity can be built within the community.

Cost and Benefit Analysis
Cost and benefit analysis dependent upon a proposed line of action should be done at this point in order to enlighten the actions implemented by the stakeholders.

Actions
The principles at the base of the decision making process instruct the direction of development issues. Actions direct the pattern of growth: the rate, place, and quality of development. A number of tools can be utilized to carry out these actions.

Tools
New tools to address growth may be considered depending on a municipality's area of concern (Porter, 1997).

Techniques for **managing the location and character of community expansion** include:
1. urban containment areas
2. development policy areas
3. promotion of infill and redevelopment in existing urban areas
4. extrajurisdictional controls within particular areas
5. limits on growth

Techniques to **protect natural resources and environmental qualities and features** include:
6. land acquisition
7. conservation zoning/planning
8. water quality/erosion control regulations
9. delineation of critical areas
10. mitigation of development impacts
11. agricultural land protection
12. watershed planning and management
13. environmental threshold standards

Techniques for **efficient provision of community infrastructure** include:
14. functional plans of existing inventory and investments
15. adequate public facility requirements
16. exactions, impact fees, and special districts
17. transportation demand management and congestion management
18. project point or rating systems

Techniques to **maintain or create a desirable quality of community life** include:
19. design reviews
20. flexible planning and design
21. incentive and performance zoning
22. historic and architectural preservation
23. neighbourhood conservation and revitalization of declining areas
24. landscape ordinances
25. tree or plant conservation requirements

Techniques to **improve economic opportunities and social equity** include:
26. economic development incentives
27. economic opportunity programs
28. affordable housing programs

Techniques for **regional and provincial/state guidance of community development** include:
29. coordination of local planning
30. reviews of developments of regional impact

Techniques to **decrease development pressure of lands** include:
31. site-value taxation
32. federal capital gains tax reform
33. minimization of inheritance tax for farmland

There are a number of tools with complex interrelationships that should be considered.

The Spectrum of Growth Management

Growth Management strategies exist along a spectrum. Municipalities may choose a strategy based on the outcomes they desire for their community and on the process that supports the realization of that vision. Growth Management can be manifested through the following venues.

Voluntary Alliances

Voluntary alliances are usually formed around single issues such as transportation, and water and sewage management. They can take the shape of a regional public service authority. Members of an alliance forge

strong interrelationships that help them think regionally. Alliances build expertise and are able to tackle larger, more difficult issues. They then usually turn to the province to seek authority in development plans. They are the organization that can then carry the region through a Growth Management program.

Regional Agencies
Regional Agencies are similar to Voluntary Alliances but include a regional component.

Mandated Growth Management
Provincially mandated Growth Management compels individual regions to comply with them through their own local growth plans. This can be assured by putting adequate funding and incentives in place.

Sustainable Development
Sustainable Development is gradually gaining recognition in North America. This model is a long term approach to development that is effective on a larger scale. Sustainable Development is successful when it balances environmental responsibilities, economic prosperity, and social equity issues.

Common Considerations in building a Growth Management Strategy

Elements considered in building a Growth Management strategy reflect the diverse characteristics of a community. Common threads include:

1. a broad scope approach to issues rooted in 'livable, healthy communities' to achieve lasting solutions when economic, social equity and environmental challenges are pursued simultaneously
2. recognizing and developing the sustainable capacity within a community and working with it
3. building resilient economies, protecting open spaces and parks, and addressing social equity issues such as affordable housing and crime rates through regionalism
4. involving a broad base of stakeholders made up of government, private, non-profit sectors, community, and individuals in inclusive partnerships thriving in active participation
5. strong leadership
6. process rather than structure – performance based direction with indicators to measure success; the direction is designed by local people rather than imposed from above; the decision making process is based on collectively derived principles

Getting Smart

Although many Growth Management frameworks currently in practice are still relatively new, municipalities considering such programs can take confidence in the many short term benefits that have already been gained. Many Growth Management communities are experiencing benefits and are confident in the future success of their programs.

The Alberta Capital Region Perspective

Regional planning in the Edmonton area first took shape with the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission (EMRPC) in the 1950s. For a number of years the Commission was seen as farsighted primarily dealing with regional development in the metropolitan area. But by 1992 the Commission was no longer in existence. The introduction of the *Municipal Development Act* in 1994 changed the role and responsibilities of municipalities. Planning shifted from a regional to an intermunicipal focus. The new Act did not provide municipalities with guidance for the direction of regional planning. Recognizing that they needed to address larger scale planning but fearing imposed limitations and controls, municipalities voluntarily formed the Alberta Capital Region Alliance, a forum that addresses regional issues.

Maintaining the Status Quo

Municipalities in the Alberta Capital Region have been successful in attracting growth and using that revenue to maintain a high quality of life. Citizens are growing to expect higher levels of municipal services that could

put added pressure on them to find new sources of revenue. This cycle exacerbates itself. "The situation is thus not sustainable over time without additional revenue streams into the community to replace and expand facilities to support the demands of a larger population. As existing facilities age the costs of maintaining obsolete infrastructure escalate." (Joe Acker, *Barriers to Cooperation, 1999).* In other words, the present pattern of growth to realize a municipality's aims of a strong community identity and healthy quality of life cannot be sustained without the injection of high levels of resources from a new and source.

Agricultural reserves and airsheds are two issues that are only recently becoming prevalent in the Alberta Capital Region. With status quo growth they may develop into more serious problems. If agricultural reserves are not established rural municipalities will seek an additional revenue base through the development of country estates. These developments typically located at the urban edge put pressure on those urban municipalities to service them to a certain level. If agricultural reserves are established development is likely to leapfrog those reserves to more outer lying areas. Agricultural reserves then become surrounded by urban settlement. The friction experienced at the urban rural edge then escalates. There is no clear solution for how to preserve agricultural land.

Decisions made on how to deal with growth directly effect the health of the environment. Global environmental protocols (Kyoto Accord) provide minimum environmental standards. Municipalities through regional planning can collectively attain these levels. By properly siting industry and decreasing the distance between employment centres and residential areas municipalities can take responsibility for the quality of their air shed.

The relationship between the urban and rural municipalities tends to be antagonistic. Growth experts recommend that such jurisdictions build relationships that are collaborative, respectful, and trusting. Those strong relationships will help them build a regional vision that will allow decision makers a level of clarity when dealing with growth and development.

"If you don't know what you are trying to be, you won't get there."
(Simon Farbrother, ACRGR Interview 2000)

Purpose of this Report

This report presents a range of options for Officials to consider in order to initiate a Growth Management framework in the Alberta Capital Region. It describes a Growth Management framework, discusses a number of issues and tools to consider in undertaking such a framework, and presents a spectrum of Growth Management strategies.

Additionally, included in this report are six case studies that show how Growth Management is being implemented in a number of cities and municipal regions across North America. These case studies present an overview of the successes and challenges involved in initiating, implementing, and maintaining a Growth Management framework.

This report is based on extensive research of Growth Management strategies and numerous discussions with local Chief Elected Officials and Chief Administrative Officers, and a panel of expert advisors recruited both locally and from across North America. The expert panel was created based on the advice of members of the Services Integration Subcommittee and discussions with the Alberta Capital Region Governance Review Project Coordinator.

Growth Management – An Introduction

The concept of managing development is well understood in the business world. Corporate managers know that management of private enterprises requires the formulation of a thoughtful strategy to guide future actions. In turn, this calls for a rational sequence of actions: estimating trends in basic conditions, defining goals and objectives, determining workable approaches to achieve those goals, and programming investments necessary to implement these approaches. Moreover, managers understand that they need to constantly review and revise their strategies, goals and approaches to keep their enterprises viable.

Management of community development follows a similar path, with essential differences: community management programs demand a public-private partnership and consensus among a large variety of stakeholders. Public programs and regulations generally are adopted by local governments to guide development that is carried out by private developers, builders, and landowners that operate within the economic marketplace. At the same time, public growth management must respond to the interests of many 'shareholders' in the public enterprise. Within communities, residents of established neighbourhoods, property owners, and business leaders voice differing perspectives on development issues. For that reason, growth management programs must acknowledge and reconcile tensions

between economic development, needs for social justice and protection of essential environmental qualities – the concept of sustainable development. A public management approach to community development provides a useful process for responding to all those concerns. (Porter, 1997)

How Growth Management Developed

Subdivision Growth after WW II

The city has historically been a thriving urban centre that drew people from small towns and rural areas in search of economic opportunity. Urban gathering places such as libraries, town halls, and post offices built in the city's core helped foster community and create a sense of pride among citizens. It is in the last 50 years that a reversal has taken place. In the post WW II era many people have increasingly abandoned urban life for the suburbs located on the outer edges of the city.

An economic boom after WW II helped many people achieve a dream home in the suburbs - the ultimate symbol of prosperity. The burgeoning national economy strengthened local economies and raised personal income levels, and lowered taxes. This era also saw a wider range of lifestyle choices for consumers. The suburbs offered affordable housing, a clean environment, and a haven for families seeking relief from overcrowding and high crime rates in the city.

Decades of suburban growth began to have a detrimental effect on the city as a whole. As investment was diverted from the urban core to the suburbs, older neighbourhoods suffered from crime and a lack of jobs and basic services.

Challenges arising from suburbanization continue today. Community identity is lost as one suburb is becoming indistinguishable from another serving to negate the characteristics that previously made an area unique. Unplanned growth endangers important natural and cultural assets that define an area's heritage and unique qualities.

New infrastructure development is putting increasing pressure on the municipality's ability to maintain existing infrastructure. Growing fiscal disparities impair the delivery and quality of services in inner cities and older suburbs.

Aging housing stock in the city is difficult to maintain because of competition from newer high end housing developments in the suburbs. Older suburbs are also decaying since they do not have the appeal of charming old neighbourhoods, fine parks, museums, or big centres of high quality jobs found in central business districts that aid gentrification.

"In a 1989 summary of cost-of-sprawl studies to date, James E Frank concluded that capital costs of streets, sewers, water, storm drainage, and schools for a typical subdivision of three houses per acre can be reduced to at least one-third by developing near basic public facilities and employment centers, at densities averaging 12 houses per acre (assuming a mix of housing types)."
– James E Frank, *The Cost of Alternative Development Patterns: A Review of the Literature* 1989

Zoning and Property Taxes

Municipalities have used zoning for land use planning. Zoning ordinances are widely used to separate incompatible land uses including permitted uses of land and buildings to determine the height and size of buildings, sizes of lots and yards around buildings, supply of parking, size and types of signs and fences, and other development characteristics.

Other types of zoning are also used to check growth. Cluster zoning allows for groups of buildings on one part of a small lot to preserve more open space and natural features on another part. Overlay zoning contains additional provisions for special features or conditions such as historic buildings, wetlands, steep slopes, and downtown residential uses. Incentive zoning provides encouragement but not the requirement that developers provide certain amenities or qualities in return for benefits such as increased density or rapid application processing for open spaces, special building features, or public art.

The property tax system has the unintentional consequence of rewarding land speculation by requiring higher taxes on buildings compared to the land upon which they sit. This leads to the deterioration of cities, the flight of developers to the suburbs, and construction of low density, cheap buildings. Fiscal zoning where cities deliberately develop predominantly expensive homes and commercial industrial buildings with low service needs limits less costly housing and therefore entry to the community by people who would normally buy there. These fiscal and regulatory zoning incentives only serve to put limited control on development therefore perpetuating sprawl.

These planning practices may have three unintended consequences:

1. exclusive suburbs that attract more businesses and affluent residents which help maintain overall tax rates
2. cities that suffer from declining demographics, worsening social problems and taxes, future accelerating the flight of businesses and residents
3. developing suburbs that lose fiscal zoning competitions are forced to bolster their tax base by accepting virtually any kind of development despite dubious character and long term costs

No matter how thorough the plan there are too many variables to plan for all of them. Changing one will have an impact on many others.

Growth Control Did Not Work

Concerns about the myriad effects of unchecked growth rose in the 1970s. Municipalities looked to Growth Control as a quick approach to addressing the challenges of sprawl. Growth Control usually took the form of population and growth caps. Population caps place limits on the number of people in a municipality. Growth caps meanwhile place limits on the number of building permits available annually.

Boulder Colorado

In Boulder, a well-intentioned service area concept has helped to solve some problems, but has created others in the process. As a result of unprecedented growth, the city of Boulder decided to limit both its geographic and infrastructure expansion. The plan, implemented in 1978, protected the city against development just outside its boundaries that would put demands on city services without helping to finance them. It also was aimed at controlling sprawl; protecting sensitive environmental areas and rural land uses; and planning, financing and providing urban services in a more rational way. By adopting the plan through an intergovernmental agreement, both the city and county gained better control over urban development and service provision, while accomplishing many other conservation objectives.

Although the service area concept creates an identifiable urban/rural edge and provided certainty to the planning process, it has a number of drawbacks. Boulder's exponential job growth has led to a significant demand for housing in adjoining communities. Th town of Superior grew in population from 225 to 3,377 in less than six years, and now it is primarily a bedroom community. Consequently, Superior has little employment and no sales tax base. The resulting imbalance has created traffic congestion, a lack of affordable housing, and school facility needs. In addition, some of the communities within the growth boundary have resisted increased density and, as a result, have not grown. – Peter Pollack *Controlling Sprawl in Boulder: Benefits and Pitfalls* 1998

Though Growth Control measures were implemented in cities the complex challenges of sprawl were not corrected.

Growth Management

Many municipalities turned to Growth Management to address growth recognizing that many variables are involved:

1. federal, provincial, and regional policies
2. local laws and practices
3. the market and actions of developers and real estate investors
4. lending practices
5. the public and community leaders' perspectives. They all need to be at the table to develop a Growth Management program.

Under Growth Management, growth is encouraged and accommodated. By focusing on the amount, rate, location, and quality of growth, there is a range of growth management models that can be implemented.

Municipalities have the opportunity to envision the future profile of their communities and regions. They can attract industries that complement and enhance this profile. New industry will provide stability for citizens, improve quality of life, and add value to communities.

New tools to address growth may be considered depending on a municipality's area of concern (Porter, 1997).

Techniques for **managing the location and character of community expansion** include:

1. urban containment areas
2. development policy areas
3. promotion of infill and redevelopment in existing urban areas
4. extrajurisdictional controls within particular areas
5. limits on growth

Techniques to **protect natural resources and environmental qualities and features** include:

6. land acquisition
7. conservation zoning/planning
8. water quality/erosion control regulations
9. delineation of critical areas
10. mitigation of development impacts
11. agricultural land protection
12. watershed planning and management
13. environmental threshold standards

Techniques for **efficient provision of community infrastructure** include:

14. functional plans of existing inventory and investments
15. adequate public facility requirements

California

California's population, which is expected to increase by a person per minute for the next couple of decades, should reach nearly 46 million by 2020. As a result, the state will need 4.3 million additional housing units. – *Is Anyone Listening? A Clarion Call for California's Leaders to Address the State's Future Needs.* 1999

In addition, California's land resources have been developed at a dramatic rate. Between 1970 and 1990, for example, the population of the Los Angeles metropolitan area grew by 45 percent, while the developed area grew by 200 percent. – Steve Sanders *Smart Growth in the Golden State: New Leadership Emerging for Sustainable Land-use Planning in California* 1998

This development pattern increases traffic congestion, requires greater public investment in facilities, and leads to losses of open space. California's startling growth projections are leaving public officials wondering how they may best accommodate future growth while protecting quality of life and efficiently providing community services and public infrastructure. - *Smart Growth: Myth and Fact* 1999

In mid 1999, the State Treasurer recognized that a 'smart' state invests in schools, roads, bridges, water facilities, public safety, and other infrastructure, particularly in light of the dramatic population growth expected, are critical to promoting continued economic vitality, environmental protection and equality of opportunity throughout the state. Specifically, the report outlines a set of strategic principles that are intended to direct future investments and contribute to the important debate of how California will best grow in the 21st century. The principles outlined in the report include reinvesting in declining communities; strong and meaningful regional planning to direct state infrastructure investments; and investments that support livable communities, sustainable development, and sound environmental practices that strengthen the economy. "It is clear," states the report, "that the challenge for policy makers is not whether California will grow, but rather, how we will grow and how investment policy can support growth patterns which bolster the state's economic, environmental, and social progress." – *Smart Investments: Special Edition of California's Debt Affordability Report* 1999

16. exactions, impact fees, and special districts
17. transportation demand management and congestion management
18. project point or rating systems

Techniques to **maintain or create a desirable quality of community life** include:
19. design reviews
20. flexible planning and design
21. incentive and performance zoning
22. historic and architectural preservation
23. neighbourhood conservation and revitalization of declining areas
24. landscape ordinances
25. tree or plant conservation requirements

Techniques to **improve economic opportunities and social equity** include:
26. economic development incentives
27. economic opportunity programs
28. affordable housing programs

Techniques for **regional and provincial/state guidance of community development** include:
29. coordination of local planning
30. reviews of developments of regional impact

Techniques to **decrease development pressure of lands** include:
31. site-value taxation
32. federal capital gains tax reform
33. minimization of inheritance tax for farmland

It takes a complex combination of these techniques and constant reassessing of the Growth Management framework for municipalities to determine the effectiveness of the techniques they implement.

"Sprawling regional development patterns are closing off avenues of advancement for low income minorities. Sprawl is leading to (1) greater dispersion of jobs, placing low skilled jobs beyond the reach of many low skilled potential workers; (2) growing fiscal disparities, which impair the quality of services in inner cities and older suburbs; and (3) greater concentrations of poverty, which have devastating impacts in the education of inner city children." - David Rusk, *Growth Management* 1996

As a result of unchecked growth the total population in the past 20 years of the 39 largest U.S. cities increased by one million people while their suburbs increased by a staggering 30 million people. Some states such as Oregon have implemented growth legislation well (Case Study #4). Other states such as Georgia (Case Study #3) have put sound legislation in place but have been unsuccessful in implementing it due to a lack of funding.

Although addressing sprawl is a relatively new concept for Canadian municipalities, the U.S. has been dealing with the challenges it presents for some time.

Smart Growth

Smart Growth encompasses the notion of Sustainable Development; a model that allows municipalities to take responsibility for a number of different issues that might have been previously outside of their scope:

1. build an inventory of the assets of their region and building capacity based on them
2. take stewardship over the local natural environment
3. recognize that local actions can have impact on global issues
4. foster healthy citizens to create a strong, vibrant and competitive region

Smart Growth is a multijurisdictional, collaborative decision making process that balances environmental responsibility, economic prosperity, and social equity issues. It strives not just to manage growth but to 'envision it'. Municipalities are challenged to establish a vision and a set of principles to help guide them as they determine future directions for planning and development in their region.

Citizens can decide what level of structure they want to deal with, how much they want to participate, and be included in the process.

Many municipalities are recognizing that unchecked growth does not happen in isolation. It impacts urban, rural, and suburban residents alike.

Broad-based partnerships that develop with a regional perspective can foster new directions in a number of areas of challenge (Clinton/Gore, 2000):

1. developing a workforce: preparing and linking people to jobs in rapidly growing suburban areas;
2. competing economically: building world class industrial and research facilities, transportation systems, and supplier networks;
3. quality of life: protecting environment, controlling traffic congestion, and fostering safe and healthy communities;
4. paying for growth: making wise investments in public facilities in growing suburbs;
5. redevelopment: revitalizing inner cities and older suburbs.

Smart Growth works well with regionalism and sustainable development because each focuses on:

1. process rather than structure
2. governance rather than government
3. working across boundaries rather than being closed to jurisdictions
4. collaboration rather than coordination
5. trust rather than accountability
6. empowerment rather than power

Growth Management is an evolutionary process.

Utah

Envision Utah is a collaborative effort of government, business, civic and environmental leaders who have joined together to determine the state's most desirable growth strategy. Since Utah's population is growing at twice the national average and the Salt Lake City alone is expected to grow to 2.7 million people by 2020, this effort is a significant undertaking. The challenge, as stated by Envision Utah officials, is "not to limit growth, but to create a vision of how we want to grow". Since 1997, Envision Utah partnership has prepared growth and development projections and various growth scenarios that demonstrate how the state might accommodate future growth. – *Envision Utah Process*, www.envisionutah.org/main.html

In a complementary effort, the state of Utah passed the Quality Growth Act, which created a commission to review growth strategies and make recommendations to the legislature in 2000. The act also created a critical land conservation fund, with a $6 million cap, to preserve agricultural and open space lands. – Smart Growth Network *Governors for Smart Growth* www.smartgrowth.org/index_frameset.html

With broad public input, the Envision Utah partnership, in collaboration with the state's Quality Growth initiative, hopes to set a course for future growth that ensures Utah's economy, environment, and quality of life will remain at a high level for years to come. – *Smart Growth: Myth and Fact. Urban Land Institute, 1999*

What is Growth Management?

Citizens are questioning the common assumptions about growth and development. While they understand the need for economic prosperity, they are questioning its effects on the quality of life of communities and the natural environment. They want growth in their jobs, revenues without environmental degradation and a diminishing quality of life. Therefore Growth Management needs to be considered.

Common definitions of Growth Management include these philosophical elements:

1. development that is economically viable and that preserves open space and natural resources
2. land use planning that is comprehensive, integrated, and regional
3. community identity and quality of life that produces healthy, productive citizens
4. public, private, and nonprofit sectors that collaborate on growth and development issues to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes
5. infrastructure that is maintained and enhanced to serve existing and new residents
6. urban centres and neighbourhoods that are integral components of a healthy regional entity
7. compact suburban development that is integrated into existing commercial areas, new town centres and/or near existing or planned transportation facilities that preserves open space

A strong education program directed at key stakeholders and the public can help ease the introduction of a Growth Management framework. A recent report (Urban Land Institute, 2000) addresses misconceptions that municipalities may encounter.

1. *Myth*: Growth Management is not a code word for 'no growth'.
Fact: Growth Management recognizes that growth and development are both inevitable and beneficial.

The best way to accommodate growth is to enhance the economy, protect the environment, and preserve or improve a community's quality of life. Real estate development strengthens the economy and enhances community prosperity enabling public and private sectors to invest more broadly in infrastructure, community amenities, education, and open space preservation.

Growth Management is a set of objectives that every community must translate into more specific actions according to its particular interests, conditions, and opportunities. It is "a dynamic process in which governments anticipate and seek to accommodate community development in ways that balance competing land use goals and coordinate local with regional (and environmental) interests." - Doug Porter, Managing Growth in America's Communities, 1997

2. *Myth*: Growth Management is antisuburb.
Fact: Growth Management encourages growth in the downtown, suburban, and fringe locations.

Market surveys from a variety of sources still show that many people want to live in suburbs or on the urban fringe. These communities can be designed as neighbourhoods based on Growth Management that give them character and a sense of place and that allow residents to not be completely dependent on their vehicles to reach amenities.

Paradoxically people want to live in the suburbs yet they are tired of the problems of the suburbs such as infrastructure and services that are becoming less and less affordable. Growth Management can be an alternate solution to address this dilemma. It encourages suburban development to integrate itself into the existing fabric and to provide a mix use of land, open spaces, and transportation options.

3. *Myth*: Growth Management creates another layer of government with regulations that slow down the development process and increase project costs.

Fact: Regulatory reform and streamlined procedures can improve predictability in the development process that in turn stimulates Growth Management.

More desirable types of development are not readily built because the system is such that they are more difficult to build, more costly, and no incentives are given to developers to veer away from traditional single use zoning in segregated areas dependant on the car. There is a need to change the regulatory process, to build communities that have integrated commercial and residential uses, minimize the employment/housing separation distance, provide bicycle and pedestrian opportunities, and protect environmental resources.

4. *Myth*: Growth Management does not sell.

Fact: The market is rapidly embracing the type of development that Growth Management encourages.

A growing segment of the population is actively seeking communities that provide them with the amenities and conveniences that urban living provides. Poll after poll shows that buyers want to live in communities that reflect the feel of a traditional small town that has a town center at its core. Studies also show that house lot sizes can shrink up to 25% before buyers notice and complain. Development that protects the environment and meets community goals can be economically successful.

Planner Benjamin Chinitz describes Growth Management as active and dynamic; it seeks to maintain an ongoing equilibrium between development and conservation, between various forms of development and concurrent provisions of infrastructure, between the demands for public services generated by growth and the supply of revenues to finance those demands, and between progress and equity"

- Benjamin Chinitz, "Growth Management: Good for the Town, Bad for the Nation?", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Winter 1990

5. *Myth*: Growth Management equals urban containment areas.

Fact: Growth Management endorses any number of practices and tools that a region deems necessary to fulfill its Growth Management philosophies.

A 'one-size-fits-all' approach to Growth Management is not appropriate given the large number of variables and characteristics unique to each region. Considerable research and thoughtful analysis of current and future development conditions should inform the collaborative and comprehensive program implemented to promote a more efficient pattern of growth. Urban containment areas are only one tool available in the Growth Management toolbox. There are many other tools that can be implemented. A strong combination of them should be used; however, many jurisdictions find this too complex and

opt for single tool solutions. This creates more challenges in the future. Growth Management prompts regions to select policies that best reflect their unique conditions and can aid them in achieving their vision for regionwide growth and development.

6. *Myth*: Growth Management will eliminate the need for new roads.
Fact: New roads will still be needed because of increases in population even though investments have been made in transit and pedestrian facilities accompanied by massive education programs.

Through the past three decades the average American took three times more trips averaging 9% longer trips. Growth Management may be able to bring travel growth more inline with population growth thereby substantially reducing the amount of investment in new roadway systems as well as improving air quality.

7. *Myth*: Growth Management is bad for business.
Fact: Businesses benefit from growth and development patterns encouraged by Growth Management.

Diverse businesses benefit from Growth Management. It produces a number of benefits: predictability, reduced traffic congestion, infill development, and healthier local economies. Businesses understand the importance of supporting their local economy and supporting unique characteristics within their communities that improves quality of life and provides a stable backdrop and stronger economy to sustain their business.

8. *Myth*: There is limited value in open space preservation with so much undeveloped land.
Fact: Growth Management recognizes the intrinsic community, economic, and environmental value of open spaces in all communities.

Important environmental components include recreational opportunities, habitat for wildlife, buffers for pollution, places for people to gather, and enhancing a community's sense of place. Surveys show that a majority of voters believe that open space preservation is a key component to community value. This translates into the economic value of a sense of place, a need for local regions to recognize the importance of agricultural lands and ensure that it remains viable and healthy, and that the farming lifestyle remains affordable for local farmers and their families.

Growth that is economically sound, environmentally friendly and supportive of community livability – growth that enhances quality of life. ULI believes that North America needs to provide strong leadership in use of land to enhance the total environment shaping future of communities, means not to engage in competition between central cities and suburbs rather to strengthen regional position in the global economy.
- Urban Land Institute, 1999

Key components of the models of Growth Management (Urban Land Institute, 2000) are as follows:

1. Growth Management objectives must relate local and regional concerns: They encourage communities to reach beyond individual interests to reflect regional needs and goals. Local governments need to recognize that communities function within the context of metropolitan economic and social activities, goals and needs.

2. Growth Management anticipates and accommodates development needs: It foresees and shapes the scope and character of future growth, identifies existing and emerging needs for infrastructure, and fashions governmental actions to meet needs. It establishes an image of what the region should look like and how it should function. Decision making is based on the ability to be guided by established common philosophies derived through a process built on relationships of trust.
3. Growth Management is a dynamic process: It is an evolving and ever-changing program of activities, a continuous process of evaluating current trends managing results, and updating objectives and methods. It requires flexibility, adaptability, and revisiting to ensure the process is on track.
4. Growth Management provides a forum and process for determining an appropriate balance between competing development goals: Public interest is weighted to private property rights. Difficult choices of emphasis, priorities, and coordination are made that translate general intentions into workable plans in the future. The forum should have diverse representation from the voices of stakeholders brought together in an arena of trust and respect to build consensus and arrive at the decisions most beneficial for the region as a whole. This can only be achieved under the aid of a skilled leader who transcends traditional lines of division.
5. Growth Management is a public proactive activity: Officials with the confidence of stakeholders direct and guide the private development process.

Growth Management recognizes connections between development and quality of life. It leverages new growth to improve the community. The features that distinguish growth management in a community vary from place to place. In general, growth management invests time, attention and resources in restoring community and vitality to center cities and older suburbs. ... Successful communities do tend to have one thing in common - a vision of where that want to go and of what things they value in their community – and their plans for development reflect these values. – Geoff Anderson *Why Smart Growth: A Primer* 1998

Building a Growth Management Framework

Those citizens who are concerned about unchecked growth are usually willing to help set up a framework for and of their region. Support for Growth Management will increase with the inclusion of a diversity of voices.

There is also value in widespread community contributions from broad based stakeholders such as citizens, developers, conservationists, community developers, agriculturists, all levels of government, businesses, and environmentalists.

Growth Management frameworks can be developed through the following cycle: establishing a philosophical position (vision and principles), creating a structure that encompasses this position, developing indicators that will provide feedback on the direction and success of the framework, and modifying the Growth Management framework accordingly to ensure compliance with the principles.

Vision

The vision is a statement that defines the quality of life of a community; what it values. It recognizes the connection between development and quality of life and identifies sense of place and its characteristics. The vision helps establish a set of principles that become a reference for the decision making process.

Principles

When stakeholders develop Growth Management principles they often consider:

1. strengthening and directing development toward existing communities
2. preserving open space, agricultural land, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
3. mixing land uses at a pedestrian scale
4. taking advantage of compact building design
5. creating walkable neighbourhoods
6. creating housing choices that are affordable
7. fostering distinctive attractive communities with a strong sense of place
8. providing a variety of transportation choices
9. encouraging community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions
10. making development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective

Principles developed become the framework for the decision making process. They help guide the process through fluctuating growth cycles to ensure decisions are not made under pressure but are made consistently over the long term.

Indicators

Indicators - the mechanisms to measure the success of the principles -should be developed in conjunction with the principles.

Decision Making Process

Involving a broadbased stakeholder group in this process allows them to exercise their rights and keeps them accountable for their actions. If a particular interest group supports a particular action they will need to understand and justify to the region the consequences of that action. By involving stakeholders capacity can be built within the community.

Cost and Benefit Analysis

Cost and benefit analysis dependent upon a proposed line of action should be done at this point in order to enlighten the actions considered by the stakeholders.

Actions

The principles at the base of the decision making process instruct the

Maryland

The state of Maryland, through its nationally recognized smart growth program, uses directed state investments to encourage smart growth. Instead of growth boundaries, the state directs its funding, including that for roads, sewers, schools, and other public investments to designated growth areas. These areas are designated for growth because they either have or are located near existing infrastructure. As a result of this policy, hundreds of millions of state dollars will be channeled into these designated areas to accommodate future growth and development. Development can still occur outside designated areas, but state funds will not be used to support such projects. Maryland's smart growth initiative is intended to reverse a pattern of development that, if continued, is predicted to consume more that 500,00 acres of forest land and farmland over the next two decades. – *Smart Growth and Neighbourhood Conservation: Preserving What's Best about Maryland* 1997

Lincoln, Nebraska

While many governments are revising their regulatory programs to encourage growth management development, some cities, such as Lincoln, Nebraska, have a long history of promoting development that reflects growth management principles. The city's commitment to regional planning started well over 60 years ago. That tradition continues today. The city of Lincoln and it neighbour, the county of Lancaster, have engaged in numerous joint comprehensive planning efforts that have led to the orderly and contiguous pattern of growth and development that is evident today. The benefits of cooperation have not been limited to planning exercises alone. The jurisdictions also have made a concerted effort to streamline the development and permitting review process, making it more of a 'green-tape' than red-tape experience. Using the comprehensive plan as it foundation, the city and county work together to expedite development that is compatible with the plan and its corresponding zoning and capital improvement programs. They have established a joint planning commission and a one-stop shop for all development project. The one-stop shop administers the entire development process, including the coordination of all departmental

direction of development issues. Actions direct the pattern of growth: the rate, place, and quality of development. A number of tools can be utilized to carry out these actions.

Tools

There are a number of tools with complex interrelationships that should be considered. One common tool is the urban containment area that has three purposes:

1. to promote compact, contiguous, and accessible development
2. to preserve open spaces, agricultural, and environmentally sensitive areas
3. to encourage redevelopment in inner city neighbourhoods and to revitalize older suburbs

Urban containment areas should not be used in isolation but in conjunction with other tools.

Evaluation

The Growth Management framework is flexible because it has a built-in evaluation mechanism that uses the predetermined indicators to measure successes, to evaluate the actions and adapt or modify them to better realize the principles.

The State of Minnesota (see Case Study #6)

In addressing the question "How can we grow in ways that improve the prosperity and quality of life for all as Minnesota competes in the knowledge, service-based, and just-in-time economy of the 21st Century?", the State of Minnesota recently developed a Growth Management framework using the above framework. They established the goals, the responsibility of the State, the principles for success, and the strategies for achieving Growth Management.

reviews. Consequently, a permit review for a project that complements the joint comprehensive plan takes less than a week. In rezoning and special exception cases, the process takes approximately four to six months. The city of Lincoln and the county of Lancaster have created a unique model that can help the public and private sectors stimulate the type of development growth management encourages. – Mike DeKalb *Lincoln/Lancaster County Planning Department* 1999

Because of these policies, developers in the community know where that can build, what they can develop, and – with reasonable accuracy – how long it will take them to complete the development review process. – Kent Seacrest *Seacrest and Kalkawski* 1999

Common Considerations

Elements considered in building a Growth Management framework reflect the diverse characteristics of a community. Common threads include:

1. a broad scope approach to issues rooted in 'livable, healthy communities' to achieve lasting solutions where economic, social equity and environmental challenges are pursued simultaneously

2. a notion of sustainability – recognizing and developing the capacity within a community and working with it

3. a regional approach – build resilient economies, protect open spaces and parks, address social equity issues such as affordable housing and crime rates.

4. multijurisdictional collaboration – involving a broad base of stakeholders made up of government, private, non-profit sectors, community, and individuals in inclusive partnerships thriving in active participation

5. strong leadership – "people who are able to get people talking and working together across boundary lines that traditionally divide and diminish a community – people from government, corporations, social agencies, ethnic groups, unions, neighbourhoods, etc; need 'boundary crossers'." (Peirce, 1998)

6. process rather than structure – performance based direction with indicators to measure success; direction designed by local people rather than imposed from above or beyond; the decision making process is based on collectively derived principles

sprawl:
the effect of unchecked growth where development progresses at unscheduled rate and direction heavily relying upon infrastructure subsidies

green space:
areas within cities that bring the natural environment to the people whether in wild state or cultivated

brownfields:
areas within the urban context that require environmental cleanup after contamination from industrial and commercial activities

stakeholder:
those people with a vested interest in a particular area no matter their path in life

Growth Management Strategies

Growth Management strategies exist along a spectrum. Municipalities may choose a strategy based on the outcomes they desire for their community and on the process that supports the realization of that vision. Growth Management can be manifested through the following venues.

Each region will create its own philosophical approach to dealing with growth and will develop its own set of tools to implement it. There is no general list of models just different approaches based on how a region philosophically decides it should deal with growth.

Voluntary Alliances

Voluntary alliances are usually formed around single issues such as transportation, airport, or water and sewage. They can take the shape of a regional public service authority. Members of an alliance forge strong interrelationships that help them think regionally. Alliances build expertise and are able to tackle larger, more difficult issues. They then usually turn to the state to seek authority in development plans. They are the organization that can then carry the region through a Growth Management program.

River Valley Alliance

The River Valley Alliance was formed in 1998 to ensure the preservation of the North Saskatchewan River Valley in the Capital Region. To achieve full representation the group brought together a broad based stakeholder group including the seven municipalities located along the river to help it develop a vision for the River Valley. The Alliance's role is to be an advisory board that may be consulted about developments affecting the River Valley throughout the Capital Region.

Chicago Illinois

The Commercial Club of Chicago is a prestigious business and service organization more than 100 years old that is composed of the top officials from leading businesses and heads of civic and educational institutions in the region. In 1909, the club commissioned the 'Plan for Chicago', which helped define growth and development patterns for Chicago in the 20th century, including lakefront preservation. With the new millenium, the club has devised another plan that it hopes will have similar impacts. The plan, entitled 'Chicago Metropolis 2020' sets broad guidelines and a philosophy for tackling a 21st century problem – sprawl. The plan proposes a host of solutions to the problems created by sprawl, including investing heavily in transportation (especially suburb-to-suburb and city-to-suburb systems), pricing vehicle taxes and fees to better reflect the true costs of driving, and establishing a regional planning authority. The Commercial Club of Chicago recognizes that well-planned communities are essential to maintaining economic prosperity in the metropolitan region. Its latest plan is intended to improve the quality of life of the region's residents, while ensuring that its economic competitiveness is maintained. – Elmer W Johnson *Chicago Metropolis 2020* 1999

Regional Agencies

Regional Agencies are similar to Voluntary Alliances but include a regional component. Examples of Regional Agencies include:

1. regional planning councils or districts
2. metropolitan transportation planning authorities
3. federal or state chartered commissions or authorities charged with protection of environmentally sensitive areas
4. regional public service authorities such as airport or transit authorities or water districts
5. regional business and civic leadership groups promoting planning
6. ad hoc groups established by interjurisdictional agreements for selective purposes
7. consolidated city/county governments and in some areas county planning organizations

Mandated Growth Management

Provincially mandated Growth Management compel individual regions to comply with them through their own local growth plans. Putting adequate funding and incentives in place will help ensure this.

Florida

When Florida encountered an environmental crisis point it was ordered by the Federal Government to address the situation. In response the State developed legislation to regulate how environmentally significant areas would be protected in light of future development. Regions were required to develop plans that complied with the state legislation. Although regions were successful in preserving environmentally sensitive lands they had limited guidance from the State to help them deal with continued development. Growth continued to go uncoordinated and unchecked. Florida has now run out of land to be developed and expects an additional one million people to come to the state in the next five years. The State's governor recently switched the responsibility for dealing with development to the regions believing that they can act more effectively on a regional level.

Sustainable Development

Sustainable Development is gradually gaining recognition in North America. This model is a longterm approach to development that is effective on a larger scale. Sustainable Development is successful when it balances environmental responsibilities, economic prosperity, and social equity issues.

Okotoks, Alberta (see Case Study #2)

Okotoks, Alberta is the most comprehensive example of the Sustainable Development model in practice to date. The Town chose this model based on the carrying capacity of its main water supply and set up a population cap of 25-30,000 people. Okotoks'

Silicon Valley, California

As globalization began to occur large corporations said that economies operate on a region wide basis. Silicon Valley is a good example of this. In the late 1980s and early 1990s the area experienced a pull back in the computer industry. The key manufacturers formed a non-profit group that developed a vision for the Valley and began to issue reports that benchmarked their vision. This process is coming out of the private sector. They perceive themselves as being part of the global economy but they see their success in achieving a successful region. This regionalism is tied with economy and quality of environment. The private sector became great advocates of regional scale planning. Idea that regions are important in planning because regions are large enough to have spill over effects but small enough for people to have a sense that they do live in a region and that their voices do make a difference. Some of regionalism's strongest advocacy is coming from the private/corporate sector, public sector and non-profit. Critical to this must be the process that everyone is working to achieve regionalism. It is much more process oriented (strategic planning, visioning, targeted campaigns to achieve specific things) and much less interested in structures that would create government at the regional level. - Allan Wallis 2000

Sustainable Development model includes activities as diverse as interlinking its recycling and waste water management programs, urban forest management, green building design, and watershed design. The Sustainable Development model is contrary to general growth patterns in Alberta which usually allow market forces to dictate how growth is going to develop and which suggest that any cap on growth will not work.

No Growth Strategy

The No Growth strategy presents radical solutions for dealing with the challenges of unchecked growth. Short term moratoriums can be placed on growth to buy time to deal with situations that usually address the environment. The No Growth strategy is seen as a last resort for dealing with the effects of growth and development. A major reason for shying away from it is that markets prefer stability and predictability and this option creates a more volatile economy.

The No Growth option removes the growth imperative from development and switches it to an environmental imperative. The environmental capacity then becomes most important to safeguard and will not be sacrificed. All other concerns become secondary. There are no examples of this program because it is presently illegal in the U.S. to completely impede development.

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA

Although conceived in the early 1980's, the master-planned community of Rancho Santa Margarita incorporates many of the principles that growth management advocates today. Located in southeast Orange County, California, the community of nearly 40,000 residents rests on 5,000 acres, of which 50 percent is protected open space. Like other well-planned communities, Rancho Santa Margarita included a mix of housing, commercial, and retail development. A town center serves as the community's central gathering place and the location of many of its retail stores. An elaborate system of pedestrian trails and neighbourhood parks offers residents numerous alternatives to driving, as well as a variety of recreational opportunities. The community's mixed-use design reduces that total number and length of automobile trips, since many of its residents also work and shop in Rancho Santa Margarita. The community also provides affordable housing for Orange County residents including housing options such as apartments, townhouses, and moderately sized and large single-family houses. The gross density of its initial village is 10 units per acre and 65 percent of the units meet the county's affordable housing criteria. (Specific developments have achieved densities of more than 25 units per acre.) The community accommodates a significant portion of the region's growth. Perhaps most importantly, Rancho Santa Margarita has proven to be very successful in the marketplace.

Rancho Santo Margarita is an example of how well-conceived master-planned suburban communities can achieve the goals of growth management: open-space protection, pedestrian orientation, mixed-use design, and the creation of 'community beyond the real estate'.

– Rancho Santa Margarita *Facts and Figures – 2nd Quarter 1999*

Sources

Clinton-Gore Administration, Building Livable Communities, (Washington, D.C., revised June 2000).

Congress for the New Urbanism, New Urbanism Basics, www.cnu.org/newurbanism.html

Growth Management Institute, *Planning for transit-focused development*, www.gmionline.org/fall1997.htm

Johnson, Curtis. Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Expert Interviews – Smart Growth, Appendix A.

Johnson, Curtis and Neal Peirce. Boundary Crossers: Community Leadership for a Global Age, (Chevy Chase, Maryland: Academy of Leadership), 1998.

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, *Effects of Urban Containment on Housing Prices and Landowner Behavior*, www.lincolninst.edu/landline/2000/may/may1.html

Metropolitan Council and the Office of Governor Jesse Ventura, *Growing Smart in Minnesota*, www.metrocouncil.org/planning/smartgrowth.htm

National Association of Home Builders, *NAHB's Statement of Policy on "Smart Growth"*, www.nahb.net/growth_issues/policy.htm
ibid. *Consumer's Survey on Growth Issues*

NPG. The Growth Management Delusion, by Dr. Gabor Zovanyi, www.npg.org/forums/growth_mgmt_delusion.htm

Porter, Doug. Managing Growth in America's Communities, (Washington, D.C.: Island Press), 1997.

Porter, Doug. Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Expert Interviews – Smart Growth, Appendix A.

Reason Public Policy Institute, *A line in the land*, World Wide Website www.rppi.org/urban/ps263.html

Silicon Valley, *The role of boundary crossers*, www.jointventure.org/siliconvalley2010/d5d.htm

Smart Growth Network, The Emerging Challenge of Regions and Regionalism, by Dr. Allan Wallis, www.smartgrowth.org/ISSUEAREA/regionalism.html
ibid, *About Smart Growth*
ibid, *Community*

Sprawl Watch Clearinghouse, *Financial and Regulatory Incentives*, wwww.sprawlwatch.org/financialandregulatory.html
ibid. *Regional Governance*
ibid. *Land Use Planning and Zoning*

Urban Land Institute, *Smart Growth: Myth and Fact*, www.uli.org
ibid, *Sprawl: No Single Cause*

Wallis, Dr Allan. Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Expert Interviews – Smart Growth, Appendix A.

Growth Management Case Studies – A Comparison

Many Growth Management frameworks are still in their infancy. Communities that have implemented the framework have gained many short term benefits. Although the long term effects of Growth Management are not known tracking mechanisms are in place and information is anxiously awaited.

Municipalities are recognizing that unchecked growth does not happen in isolation. It impacts urban, rural, and suburban residents alike. Many concepts such as Sustainable Development and Regionalism work hand in hand with the Growth Management framework to address sprawl. Different frameworks can contain many similarities from which we can learn. Following is a comparison of several Growth Management frameworks currently in practice. The case studies provided are:
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Okotoks, Alberta
Atlanta, Georgia
Portland, Oregon
Victoria, B.C.

Guiding Principles
Halifax's guiding principles include protecting existing stable neighbourhoods as well as encouraging appropriate new housing, ensuring the waterfront remains a valuable public asset, and enhancing park and recreational facilities. Okotoks and Victoria's principles are more philosophical and 'green' in nature. They include living within the carrying capacity of the environment, leaving equal or better opportunities for the next generation, creating a balance between the economic prosperity, social equity, and environmental issues. Portland is also concerned with environmental issues. Alternately, Atlanta's main focus is to deal with the critical aspects of sprawl: air and water pollution, traffic congestion, and economic disparity between its northern and southern suburbs.

Scope of Responsibility
Originally, the Halifax Metropolitan Authority was responsible for transit, landfill, and corrections services. After amalgamation, the Halifax Regional Municipality took over all municipal activities. Similarly, Okotoks Town Council is responsible for municipal affairs in addition to innovative recycling programs, green buildings, water system and pollution centre upgrades and acquire environmentally significant lands. The Capital Regional District of Victoria is similarly charged with implementing sustainable measures as well as ensuring affordable housing and promoting economic development.

Level of Consultation
The Halifax area undertook an education program to gain support from citizens for a provincial amalgamation after the process was

implemented. Surveys, public meetings, and information sharing lead to 40% support for the new region. In Okotoks, Town Council undertook a similarly extensive education campaign but implemented it before they took action. They presented three options to the community through surveys and a media campaign that would help Council set the future direction for the Town. In comparison, citizens in the Victoria region were widely involved in helped their region develop the principles and models for the future. Alternatively, Portland's approach to sprawl was originally driven by a grass roots movement lead by environmentalists. Recently, citizens were involved in choosing the best option for the new urban growth boundary. In Atlanta, a broadbased stakeholder group has recently become involved in reviewing the state's Planning Act to better understand the direction and patterns of growth.

Time Frame

Halifax underwent amalgamation in 1996. After four years of making the transition to a regional government, the area will undergo its second election in 2001. Okotoks began its Growth Management process in 1997. By the next year the Town had developed its Municipal Development and Interjurisdictional Development Plans and determined its urban growth boundary. In 1999 it worked with the business community to gain its support for the process. Victoria is also relatively new to the Growth Management process. In 1996 it began developing its Regional Growth Strategy. Two years later it had developed models to carry the Strategy out. Alternatively, Atlanta and Portland have been dealing with sprawl for many years. In 1989 Georgia passed the *Georgia Planning Act*. Ten years later the Atlanta region was still dealing with major sprawl. It is only in the past decade that the region began a review of the *GPA* to further deal with unchecked growth. Portland has been more successful. In 1977 it set its urban growth boundary and developed a long term Growth Management plan. Twenty years later it reassessed the plan and developed a larger urban growth boundary and reserve area.

Conclusion

All of these municipalities and regions approach Growth Management from various angles and with differing backgrounds yet ultimately, they all want the best for their jurisdictions and feel that the Growth Management framework is the way to achieve this.

Case Study #1 - Halifax, Nova Scotia

Summary

The Halifax area underwent a provincially legislated amalgamation in 1996 when four municipalities were combined under the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM). The new creation is not regional in nature but rather a single municipality with a giant geographic boundary of 6475 square kilometres. After an initial struggle to

integrate the services and administrative activities of 23 districts, the HRM is now undertaking a regional planning exercise to address Growth Management measures for the area.

Area Profile

The Halifax Regional Municipality has a population of approximately 360,000 people. Over the years the population has become more dispersed throughout the Region with a notable decline in the urban core's share of the population. Both the rural-urban fringe and suburban development are becoming more pronounced. More than half of the residents lives in the suburbs around the City of Halifax, with less than one quarter of the population living in the urban core. Twenty percent of the area residents live in the rural-urban fringe with the remaining population living in rural areas.

Topography plays a role in the growth pressure on the Region. The majority of the jobs are found on the Peninsula and the majority of the people holding them live off the Peninsula in the surrounding suburbs. Traffic congestion is becoming a concern since there is presently little relief to the evermounting volume of cars on the major roadways each day. The Region is trying to encourage more housing developments in the downtown to help alleviate this pressure.

History of Growth

Before 1996 the Halifax area was made up of four municipalities: the City of Halifax, the City of Dartmouth, the Town of Bedford, and Halifax County Municipality. Each municipality had a representative on the Metropolitan Authority, the body that dealt with transit, landfill, and corrections services. Competition for industry and residents was strong between the municipalities. Because they brought their own local concerns to the Authority, little of a regional nature was accomplished. This lack of regional focus prompted the Province to initiate a number of studies to examine the costs and benefits of amalgamation. These studies indicated an overwhelming need for amalgamation. In April 1996, legislation was passed that forced the four municipalities to merge.

Administrative Structure of the HRM

A mayor elected at large and locally elected municipal councillors representing the 23 districts form the HRM Council. A chief administrative officer provides policy advice to the Council and facilitates the HRM's transition and strategic direction.

The HRM Council and administrative structure focus on a number of different areas:

1. public service restructuring between the municipalities
2. a new tax structure
3. harmonization of the bylaws and regulations between the former municipalities

4. a reduction in the number of collective agreements
5. private-public partnerships on a new state-of-the-art solid waste system
6. a multi-year financial plan
7. a balanced budget for 1999-2000 with no tax increase
8. an alternative service delivery initiative
9. a program and strategy review with costing and business strategies
10. business plans incorporating results measurements

Launching the HRM

The planning process to officially launch the HRM began in 1998. A community based committee of downtown residents, business people, and stakeholders undertook an extensive consultation process to educate residents about the amalgamation using:

1. public opinion surveys
2. public meetings
3. public workshops
4. public open houses
5. newsletters distributed throughout the area
6. daily postings mounted on the HRM's website

In its initial stages the amalgamation process received 40% of public support thanks in part to a successful public education campaign. Through the consultation process a community vision, objectives, and policy directions for the HRM took shape.

A summary of the main planning directions for the HRM was presented in the fall of 1998. A citizen steering group was formed that worked in conjunction with neighbourhoods. Throughout 1999 they further developed the plan and landuse bylaws. There was extremely good representation from the public throughout the process. The public said it believed that:

1. existing stable neighbourhoods needed protection
2. the waterfront should be recognized as a valuable public asset
3. parks and recreation facilities should be enhanced
4. appropriate new housing should be encouraged

Benefits of New Municipality

Initially the HRM believed that the cost reduction resulting from the consolidated municipalities would appear overnight. In reality it is only beginning to appear.

The Council is expecting a number of improvements in the administration of the HRM and in its quality of life:

1. better utilization of human resources within the administration
2. higher level of services delivered throughout the HRM
3. the whole of HRM is now treated as one economic region
4. more equity between the various council areas: sharing of revenues, liabilities and expenditures

5. community pride for the whole HRM is fostered by local communities who are nurture their own identity and have authority over their local zoning decisions
6. a tax structure has been established that reflects the rural/urban demographics of the resident and their varied level of services required

Plans for the Future

The HRM is conducting a further regional planning exercise to address:

1. the pace of growth in the suburbs. Council may reserve land areas that should be preserved against development and recognize that they need to be protected at all costs.
2. how the area's topography plays a role in the growth pressures of the HRM. There are a limited number of travel corridors for residents to get from their homes in the rural-urban fringe to the majority of jobs in the urban core. The HRM is trying to encourage more housing developments in the urban core to help alleviate this problem.
3. recognizing the needs and preferences of particular groups as well as the requirement of the community for coherent, efficient livable settlements
4. revitalizing central cities by encouraging the replacement of obsolete land uses such as dock lands and defraying factories with dwellings and commercial use and implementing attractive housing development schemes, cluster housing, and mixed use areas
5. improving urban access using alternative transportation.
6. featuring compact transit-oriented suburbs with employment nodes
7. designating open space systems within urban growth boundaries

The regional planning exercise will continue into Spring 2001.

Sources

Halifax Regional Municipality, www.region.halifax.ns.ca

Ken Meech, CAO, Halifax Regional Municipality, Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Appendix A - Expert Interview

Case Study #2 - Okotoks, Alberta

Summary

The Town of Okotoks operates on a Sustainable Development model based on a population cap of 25-30,000 people. This model was determined by the carrying capacity of its main water supply, the Sheep River. In combination Okotoks has decided to investigate other diverse activities such as interlinking its recycling and waste management programs, urban forest management, green building design, and watershed design. This is contrary to general growth

patterns in Alberta that usually allow market forces to dictate how growth is going to develop and that suggest that any cap on growth will not work. Okotoks has been recognized internationally for its sustainability initiatives.

Area Profile

Okotoks, Alberta began as an agricultural community. With the oil boom the Town became the region's oil distribution centre. In the 1970's Okotoks became a commuter town for residents who worked in the larger metropolitan cities surrounding it. With 11,000 residents the Town is located 15 minutes from Calgary in the Sheep River Valley.

A Growth Environment

Okotoks' population grew by a record 8% in 1999. In previous years it also had high growth rates. The Town is located next to Calgary, one of the hottest housing markets in Canada. It is predicted that 50% of Calgary's growth (250,000 people) over the next 30 years will occur south of Highway 22X. This means the twinning of Highway 2A could soon be a reality bringing Calgary right to Okotoks' door and heaping on it even more pressure to grow.

With this fact looming Town Council recognized the need to address the issue of growth sooner rather than later. It considered three options:

1. growth without limits
2. planning for growth without limits and implementing with it pieces of the Sustainable Development model
3. managing growth through Sustainable Development

After assessing the carrying capacity of its watershed and investigating the cost of new water infrastructure the Town determined that the Sustainable Development model made the most sense to address future growth.

Taking it to the Public

A community survey helped Council confirm its decision to move to a Sustainable Development model. Residents believed that the Town should:

1. live within the carrying capacity of their environment
2. leave to the next generation equal or better opportunities
3. create a balance between economic opportunities, social concern, and environmental conservation
4. recognize that the health of the environment and the health and quality of life of humanity are related and interlinked
5. recognize that the efficient use of resources is essential
6. recognize that sustainability is a grass roots initiative that must be supported by the community

Principles of Sustainability

Town Council adopted some of the guiding principles from the Ontario Roundtable on the Environment and Economy for their Sustainable Development model. These principles include:

1. accounting that reflects all long term economic and environmental costs and benefits not just those of the current market
2. the notion that the best decisions are those made on sound, accurate and up-to-date information
3. that the quality of social and economic development must take precedence over quantity of development
4. that nature and the rights of future generations must be respected

Council determined that Sustainable Development also required the Town to implement four policy innovations:

1. laws establishing growth limits around existing cities and relating new developments to the availability of infrastructure and public facilities
2. local zoning that ties development directly to the carrying capacity of the natural landscape and environment
3. public policies that make the creation of communities the primary objective of development regulation
4. restoration of natural landscapes in the by passed and other derelict urban areas and other policies to restore vitality to older cities.

Strategies for Achieving Sustainability

Council's basic strategies for achieving Sustainable Development include:

1. using resources efficiently to make the community thrive
2. meeting local needs by using resources effectively
3. investing in sufficient and sustainable infrastructure
4. protecting and enhancing community quality of life
5. creating new businesses that provide services or products that protect or restore the environment
6. developing a community-based ecosystem

The foundation for Okotoks' Sustainable Development model was built into the Town's Municipal Development Plan. Council believed that they must provide competitive tax rates while providing services desired by the residents. Within the Municipal Development Plan they included the following actions:

1. identifying the major expansion zones for commercial industrial activity and building out the tax base to 22%; they believe that the burden of the municipality should not be carried solely by the residents
2. creating mixed land use development–placing home, work, recreation, and daily needs within close proximity to each other. This will improve lifestyle by reducing reliance on cars,

providing pedestrian options for the pursuit of these activities and providing local opportunities
3. reducing the road carriage by one metre. This pavement reduction will accommodate the planting of trees and right of ways on both sides of the road to improve streetscaping. Improved sidewalks will make it more comfortable for pedestrians.
4. development is good but not development beyond the ability of the river to supply Okotoks with water and to allow for effluent discharge back into the river

The Town further believed they needed to:
1. define growth around the Sheep River
2. develop urban forest policies that will create and expand a healthy urban forest
3. negotiate with regional municipalities and the Province to establish a regional watershed agreement
4. reduce their reliance on cars through mixed land use and local employment opportunities
5. purchase all river valley flood lands and preserve them in their natural state

The initial steps they took to move Okotoks toward Sustainable Development were to:
1. institute an innovative recycling program
2. acquire environmentally significant lands in the river valley
3. reduce energy consumption in buildings
4. upgrade the water system and plan to upgrade the pollution control center
5. set aside lands for a comprehensive school system
6. advise Alberta Infrastructure that the maximum build out of Highway 2A should be four lanes rather than six
7. other visionary decisions that are still on the table

Actions to provide town residents with adequate housing and employment options for a diverse population covering their entire life cycle were also built into the MDP including:
1. ensuring that 30% of the housing population will be non-traditional and 70% traditional by build up from the current 17% non-traditional and 83% traditional
2. build community facilities that meet the needs of a broader demographic
3. maintain open space and pathway systems
4. plan for a more comprehensive public transit system

Keeping Residents in the Picture

There has been much public input into the Sustainable Okotoks model. A website was developed, a series of educational articles ran in the local newspaper, and a massive community survey was conducted to solicit the opinions of local residents. These measures

ensured that Council had a clear policy direction from residents. It will conduct future surveys to ensure that the Town continues to have the moral authority of the residents.

Council also formed a strong partnership with the business community through the Chamber of Commerce. The Town built measures into their Municipal Development Plan and Intermunicipal Development Plan that recognized potential business opportunities, included easier land use bylaws, a universal tax rate, and a plan to eliminate business licenses.

As well, Council worked with local developers to conduct an inventory of land banks, created a base for future development within the urban boundaries, and provided the developers with options for housing stock for which there will be a market.

Dealing with the Neighbours

Okotoks has a good relationship with Foothills Municipal District, its closest neighbour. When it decided to implement a Sustainable Development model, Okotoks made it clear to FMD that they would not be competing with them for the same development business. The Town told their neighbour they were implementing a population cap and would not provide services beyond their municipal limits to prevent leap frog development. FMD has worked with Okotoks to establish a strong Intermunicipal Development Plan that could strengthen the region.

Benefits of Sustainability

The Town feels a number of benefits will be gained from operating under a Sustainable Development model. They include:

1. shifting the asset target base to create more business development and employment opportunities moving from a 12% commercial/industrial and 83% residential asset base to a 22% commercial/industrial and 78% residential asset base through build out
2. developing mixed land use and proportionally more commercial industrial land to guarantee Okotoks status as a regional service centre
3. expanding the trade area
4. stable financing for maintaining infrastructure
5. creating a unique identity for the Town through strong architectural style and community design
6. developing a vision that includes an adequate industrial development niche that they presently do not have. The Town hopes to attract high technology, green, and knowledge-based industries

Costs of Sustainability

Town Council recognizes that there will be some costs to limiting growth in the community. Future additions to the business

community will be limited as Okotoks reaches a build up of population. As well, higher architectural standards may have a higher cost with an offsetting long-term gain.

Sources
Town of Okotoks, www.Town.okotoks.ab.ca

Will Pearce, Town Manager, Okotoks, AB, Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Appendix A - Expert Interview

Case Study #3 - Atlanta, Georgia

Summary
Atlanta is a dynamic and successful city whose growth has run wild. The region has four of the 10 fastest growing counties in the U.S. More than 650,000 people have come to the area since 1990. It is predicted that in the next 25 years, more than two million people will be added to the population.

In the 1980s Atlanta reached a critical point facing issues of uncontrolled growth such as extremely poor air quality, water pollution, excessive traffic congestion, and major sprawl. It has only been in the last ten years that the Region has finally begun to institute Growth Management programs to address the impact uncontrolled growth has had on the area and to plan for its future development.

Area Profile
Atlanta is an active metropolitan area that stretches 160 kilometres from its northern to southern limits. It has a population of three million people with the busiest airport in the U.S. It is home to some of the top multinational corporations and hosted the largest Olympic Games in history.

History of Growth
In 1940 Atlanta was a small southern metropolis of 500,000 people. In 1946, the City established a regional highway transportation plan recognizing that highways were a key factor in maintaining the area's competitiveness. Through the 1940s and into the 1950s Atlanta did not attempt to stop growth in any way. In fact, state land use laws were progrowth as were city residents who wanted to recruit more businesses to help develop the region's economy.

Annexation in the 1950s tripled Atlanta's size but it still remained one of the smallest major U.S. cities.

This relentless pace of growth continued into the 1980s has defined the growth patterns of Atlanta known today. The patterns of development around the area's road infrastructure have contributed to two of the most critical sprawl related issues in the area: a huge amount of traffic congestion and air pollution. The Atlanta

Metropolitan Region also experienced a large job and population growth on its northern and outer portions with relatively little growth in the urban core and southern suburbs. By the end of the 1990s the region had a population of three million.

Defining the Problem

The problem of growth in Atlanta has been twofold: too much suburban growth compounded by an imbalance between the northern and southern parts of the region. Most of the new growth has taken place in the northern fringe of the Atlanta region within the City and its suburbs. Exurbs even further north have only contributed to world record setting commute times for workers. The business community has voiced its concerns about Atlanta's uncontrolled growth. Hewlett Packard decided not to go ahead with a major expansion project because they said sprawl and its congestion were making the city an unlivable place for their workers.

Revitalizing the declining southern areas may take pressure off those areas that are experiencing rapid growth. Regional coalition building may be one way to beginning the process of rebalancing Atlanta area growth patterns.

Addressing Growth

In 1989 the *Georgia Planning Act* (GPA) came into effect to address the impact of uncontrolled growth as well as future development.

A Vision 2020 was a massive public outreach campaign initiated in 1991 that brought together thousands of citizens to create a shared vision for the region's future development. This shared vision produced 41 initiatives that now help guide all of the Atlanta Regional Council's planning activities. This vision and the tools to achieve it were taken to local government and grassroots organizations throughout the Atlanta Region. It provided a new direction in assisting regional communities and gave local governments a variety of avenues to ensure best growth decisions. Land use related elements of *A Vision 2020*:

1. tree ordinance requires a 120 foot buffer along the highway Georgia 400 and a minimum tree density of twenty units per acre.
2. developed public/private partnerships to address downtown parking problems and resulting cooperative parking agreement
3. utilize tax incentive programs to direct growth into designated areas
4. created a Design Review Board to review all exterior designs of non-single family residential buildings within the city limits
5. charging impact fees for transportation improvements, Parks/Recreation and Fire

Local Regulations and Planning Programs implemented in the City of Atlanta:

1. City of Atlanta's planning program based on community involvement through the Neighborhood Planning unity concept.
2. A new Neighborhood Commercial District has been added to the Zoning ordinance, which allows development closer to property lines in all commercial districts, mixed-uses and specific design guidelines.
3. All commercial zones in the City have allowed residential development as a special use permit.
4. Atlanta has modified its light industrial district zoning to allow for residential uses in building 50 years old or older.
5. The City has completed a Parks, Open Space and Greenways Plan that is being implemented through the acquisition of recreation and conservation easements. Other environmental/open space planning included a series of ordinances regulation development along stream corridors.
6. The Atlanta Transportation Plan focuses on alternative transportation modes including transit, bicycle/pedestrian facilities and bridges.
7. The City assisted in the development of the plan Blueprint Midtown and a Midtown Special public interest zoning district has been developed and a midtown Community Improvement District established.
8. Atlanta has target resources on infill and redevelopment opportunities –special neighbourhood focus plans has been completed for a number of areas; these plans describe transportation, land use and economic characteristics used as a basis to establish neighbourhood redevelopment corporations
9. Upcoming planning activities and studies for Atlanta include: developing a South River Watershed for southeast Atlanta, developing a special historic district zone for certain areas to allow for greater density, developing a new multifamily residential zoning district and creating a special public interest district for a central transit station.

It is believed these initiatives will help correct some of the effects of Atlanta's rampant sprawl and close the socioeconomic division between the northern and southern parts of the City.

In 1998 the Georgia Department of Consumer Affairs organized the Planning and Growth Management Task Force, made up of a broad base of stakeholders, to review the *Georgia Planning Act*. The Task Force's mission was to:

1. evaluate the effectiveness of the provisions of the GPA regarding the State's future land management needs
2. review growth strategies currently in use in other areas including regulatory approaches, incentives, governmental structure, review arrangements and urban planning approaches

3. assess the applicability of those techniques for use statewide and in the Atlanta Metro area
4. think creatively about new options for approaching growth issues in the Atlanta region and in the state

Around the same time, the Atlanta Regional Council formed the Growth Strategies Reassessment Task Force (GSRTF) to recommended ways to address Georgia's expanding planning and Growth Management challenges including urban sprawl, a decline in air and water quality, and continued decline of older urban areas. The GSRTF made a conscious effort to make realistic recommendations that would not require an amendment to the state constitution and will only entail minimum infringement on existing powers of various local governments, agencies or organizations within the State. These recommendations could be implemented independently but preferrably should be implemented simultaneously. Their recommendations follow:

1. State Growth Management Vision

Although the *Georgia Planning Act* required local governments to implement comprehensive plans, it had no broad vision to guide the State's growth and development and to promote desirable growth patterns. The *GPA* gave no direction to local and regional entities on the land use and development issues. Even though the *GPA* was implemented growth was still incredibly out of control to the point where Atlanta was cut off from federal funding for the environment. The Sierra Club named Atlanta the city with the most sprawl in the U.S.

Recommendation:
"A State Vision for Growth Management needs to be developed that includes:
- identification of general problems, trends and opportunities facing the State
- general goals for the State
- statement of state policy on Growth Management and sprawl
- strategies for achieving the state vision
- strategic plans for all state agencies that are consistent with the vision
- a state capital improvement program consistent with the statewide policies
- best development practices that guide regional development centres and local governments in review of development proposals
- identification of how state investments will be targeted to discourage sprawl and promote environmentally sensitive areas of the state"

The Task Force suggested the State's Development Council that carries out the functions spelled out in the *GPA*, should adopt a state vision. The state vision should build on regional planning efforts,

hold forums to seek public input into the development of the state vision, and look to the governor for strong leadership in developing this state vision.

A four year review and update by the Council on the State Growth Management Vision will be required to ensure it remains current, flexible, and doable.

2. Financial Support

The Task Force suggested there was a lack of financial support to promote good planning practices on a regional and local level. Increased state funding and new programs are necessary to encourage local governments to comply with stronger planning and Growth Management.

Local governments received the major part of their funding from property and sales tax. To them more development equalled more revenue and a number of local governments were competing with each other to attract new development.

Recommendation:
"The State should increase the incentives and financial support for encouraging good planning and Growth Management practices by regional entities by:
- including all state administered funding and permitting as the incentive for compliance with the state's minimum planning and Growth Management requirements
- offering incentives for the adoption of best Growth Management practices. These special incentives should be in addition to those linked to minimal compliance of state planning requirements and should only be available to reward local governments that go beyond the minimum requirements by adopting specific Growth Management policies and practices recommended by the State."

3. Regionalism

The Task Force indicated that the *Georgia Planning Act* did not provide sufficient incentives to ensure cooperation between state, local, and regional entities. Local governments have autonomous control over their own matters including managing land use. There is little intergovernmental coordination or cooperation on Growth Management issues. The State should encourage it as cooperation is critical in dealing with interjurisdictional issues such as air quality and Growth Management practices.

Traditionally, state grants and loans have been tied to local government projects. The State should encourage multijurisdictional approaches around regional infrastructure.

Regional entities have had little legal status and limited powers although the GPA formally established regional development

councils and required them to prepare regional comprehensive plans and to review large scale developments for their interjurisdictional impacts.

Mediation was the only tool provided to regional development councils to handle interjurisdictional disputes. However, because it was not mandatory it was often not an effective method to resolve disputes and was therefore hardly ever used.

Recommendation:
"The State government should take a leadership role in promoting regionalism in Georgia by:
-encouraging and facilitating regional approaches to transportation, water supply, and sewage treatment services in Georgia's metropolitan areas
- strengthening the GPA to require that as part of the process of developing the regional comprehensive plans all local governments in the region agree and adopt regionwide planning policies to guide local planning efforts consistent with the regional plan
- formally empowering regional development councils to act as guardians of the regional plan by reviewing and commenting on activities of their constituent local governments regarding consistency with the regional plan
- imposing significant sanctions on local, regional, or state public entities for not acting consistently with the regional plan or the review findings of regional development councils.

4. Limiting Growth

The Task Force suggested that the practices, policies and funding decisions of local and state governments encouraged scattered and uncoordinated development. It was within the mandate of local jurisdictions to deal with zoning regulations and other ordinances that would restrict certain types of development and encourage redevelopment and infill. Local municipalities did not provide transportation alternatives that lead to congestion and pollution.

Recommendation:
"Georgia's state government must take a leadership role in addressing the governmental practices that encourage scattered and uncoordinated development patterns by:
- requiring all state agencies to identify and mitigate policies and practices that encourage scattered and coordinated development patterns
-offering incentives and other support to encourage revitalization and infill in areas already served by existing infrastructure and services
- encouraging local governments to implement policies and practices that will result in more efficient and environmentally sound development

To encourage local governments to implement the types of policies and practices needed to foster better development patterns, the State should offer incentive patterns that might include the following: expedited state permitting, exclusive access to selected state grant and loan programs, bonus points in the competition for state grant and loan programs, exemption from particular state mandated requirements. These incentives should only be available to governments that adopt Growth Management policies and practices recommended by the State. These might also include such practices as minimum density zoning, established urban service areas, providing incentives for infill development, implementing traffic calming measures. The specifics as to best Growth Management practices and the incentives to be offered to governments adopting these practices should be identified as part of the process of developing a state vision. Enactment of state planning enabling legislation will be needed to authorize Georgia's local governments to authorize some of the best Growth Management practices.

5. Local Planning Requirements

Under the *GPA* all governments were required to develop the same complex planning programs. The Task Force suggested this was not realistic or feasible because there was not enough funding or expertise to carry out the plans. Local governments should be encouraged to implement policies and practices for more efficient and environmentally sound development.

Recommendation:

"Having multiple levels of local planning and Growth Management requirements will be critical to local government acceptance of the additional responsibilities that will be imposed on them if other recommendations contained in the report are implemented.

- the minimum standards for local comprehensive planning should be changed from their current requirements to be more responsive to the particular needs of local governments depending on their growth pressures. There should be multiple levels of planning requirements: the more rigorous requirements applying to governments that exceed total population or growth rates while less rigorous requirements would apply to the state's remaining local governments.
- similarly the government's recommended best Growth Management practices should vary by region of the state depending on the particular growth pressures and environmental concerns facing each region.

6. Local Plan Implementation

Although the *GPA* required that each local government write a comprehensive plan there were no requirements that the plan be implemented or used in decision making. The Task Force suggested that this implementation gap was because local elected officials did not feel involved in the development of the plan and that they did not have enough expertise to use the comprehensive plan in their planning and development activities.

Recommendation:
If (in relation to limiting sprawl) this State is to be more proactive at encouraging local governments to implementing policies and practices that will result in more efficient and more environmentally sound development it will first be necessary to ensure that its local governments have a firm foundation in basic planning practices; that they are implementing their plans and using them for day to day decision making; that they are using capital facility programming or some other sound approach for decision making on the provision of public infrastructure; and that they are attempting to making zoning and other land use decisions consistent with the comprehensive plan.

None of this is encouraged or required by the State at this time. The State must make it clear that it expects local governments to follow their local comprehensive plans and to make decisions that are consistent with these plans by:
- requiring newly elected local officials to receive training in how to use the comprehensive plan as a decision making tool, the state planning requirements and expectations.
- requiring each local government to report on what it has done to implement its comprehensive plan and withholding qualified local government status for failure to satisfactorily implement or make decisions consistent with the plan
- requiring that all state funding and permits provided to all local governments be limited to activities that are clearly consistent with their comprehensive plan
- requiring that decisions by local governments and other public entities regarding the use of property owned by that government or other agencies be consistent with the comprehensive plan of the government or city in which the project is located.

7. Participation in Local Government
A number of stakeholders such as development authorities, boards of education, water and sewer authorities, and the public and private sector did not participate in the local planning process.

The Task Force suggested that local governments collaborate with other local jurisdictions on the comprehensive planning processes. This will provide them with the opportunity to share information and common solutions that can be incorporated into a plan. They can use this as a way to evaluate the effectiveness of services, identify improvements and plan for future growth and services needs.

Recommendation:
"The State should encourage coordination among stakeholders on local planning matters by requiring:
- any local or regional agencies that are recipients of state financial assistance including school systems, public authorities such as water and sewer authorities, development authorities and housing authorities to participate in the local comprehensive planning process

and to develop joint comprehensive plans in all city or county jurisdictions in which they operate.
- withholding state administered funding and permits for any activities of local or regional agencies that are inconsistent with local comprehensive plans for effective jurisdictions.
- requiring that state agencies make reasonable and prudent efforts to make funding and facility siting decisions that are consistent with applicable local and regional plans.

8. **Environmental Protection**
The Task Force suggested that environmental protection measures were not adequately implemented and that there was no state support to enforce these regulations.

Recommendation:
"The State should enhance protection of important environmental resources by:
-adding protection measures for air quality, historic resources, and coastal resources to the Department of Natural Resources' rules for planning criteria
- the protection measures for historic resources should apply statewide
- coastal resources should be consistent with the State's existing coastal zone management program
- the most rigorous air quality protection requirements should apply to local governments within and adjacent to federally designated nonattainment areas. A less rigorous set of protection measurements should be required of other local jurisdictions that exceed air quality thresholds to be established in the Georgia Environmental Protection Division.
- establishing an enforcement monitoring program with the Department of Natural Resources which may also provide technical and financial assistance to local governments. Suspension of qualified local government status will be recommended for any local government failing to demonstrate adequate enforcement of the required protection measures.

Out of the Task Force came the hope for better approaches to dealing with growth and its effects in a holistic way, including addressing levels of responsibility.

Moving Forward
The Atlanta Region has hope in dealing with the effects of growth. Just two years ago the Atlanta Regional Commission created the Georgia Regional Transit Authority (GRTA) with members from the Chamber of Commerce, government, and environmental organizations. The Authority is seen as a radical tactical response to a critical problem that will hopefully become the forum and catalyst for dealing with the larger issues of Growth Management. It was given the task of reducing traffic congestion, directing new growth,

and addressing the Region's poor air quality in order to regain federal funding. The Authority was also given the power to issue bonds for transportation projects and given broad authority to vote down highway projects and other large development that it felt could harm the Region's air quality.

A recently commissioned report has recommended that the Atlanta Region use the Authority to compel it to redo its comprehensive plans and to determine where transit is going to be extended. The report further recommends that for Growth Management measures to work in the Atlanta Region they must be broad and multifaceted and address the forces that lead to uncontrolled growth.

Sources

Atlanta Regional Commission, *Growth Strategies Reassessment Task Force Final Report,* www.atlantaregional.com

The Brookings Institute, *Moving Beyond Sprawl: The Challenge for Metropolitan Atlanta,*
www.brookings.edu/es/urban/atlanta/executivesummary.htm

Senator Max Cleland, *Senator Cleland Announces GAO Smart Growth Study in Northern Georgia* media release,
www.senate.gov/cleland/082799.html

Sprawl Watch Clearinghouse, Georgia,
www.sprawlwatch.org/states/georgia.html

Case Study #4 - Portland, Oregon

Summary

The Portland Metropolitan Region, which encompasses the City of Portland and its surrounding area, has gained the reputation for limiting sprawl, saving rural land, and protecting green spaces for the past 25 years. The Region has been extremely successful in limiting growth within its boundaries. A strong environmental movement and innovative state legislation have been a factor in the Portland Metropolitan Region's success in coping with sprawl and planning for future growth.

Area Profile

Good housing prices, a thriving urban core, and a less than 2% unemployment rate make Portland, Oregon one of the most desirable places in the U.S. to live. The Region has the country's only elected regional government. The Portland Metropolitan Region is made up of three counties and 24 municipalities, has an urban growth boundary measuring 595 square kilometres. A reassessment of the urban growth boundary has increased the urban area to less than 645 square kilometres. The Region's current population is 1.3 million people. It expects its population to grow by 50% over the next 45 years.

Implementing Growth Strategies

Thirty years ago, Portland experienced the effects of growth through declining inner city and annexation wars. A strong environmental movement was the stimulus for the Region to begin considering policies to deal with issues of sprawl.

In 1970 Portland organized a regional governance structure to oversee the Portland Metropolitan Region. Over ten years its policies were interwoven with state and local development policies to form a cohesive, strategic approach to development for the entire Metro area. Within this time period the State passed a farsighted planning law requiring Oregon's municipalities to develop comprehensive land use plans and to establish an urban growth boundary around their perimeter.

The Columbia Regional Association of Governments (CRAG) originally oversaw regional issues in the Portland Metropolitan Region. It began as a federated board of representatives from four counties and 14 cities that grew to represent five counties and 31 cities. CRAG was unable to build consensus around a long range regional land use plan. Its members were often torn between wanting to look at regional issues and protecting their own local autonomy. In the late 1970s Portland's regional governance structure was overhauled. CRAG was abolished and its regional planning responsibilities given to the Portland Metropolitan Services District within the Portland Metropolitan Region.

The newly enhanced Metropolitan Services District was responsible for regional solid waste disposal, regional air and water quality, the regional zoo, and the Oregon convention centre. The District was eventually renamed the Portland Metropolitan Region. Residents voiced their approval for the new entity recognizing that regional government gave the area the power to locate and coordinate development within its different jurisdictions to prevent developers from leapfrogging or promoting competition between jurisdictions.

Portland Metropolitan Region Council is a directly elected body that adopts regional policies designed to ensure the efficient use of land, adequate land for residential development, and a fair share strategy for meeting housing needs in the Region. The Region's Department of Growth Management Services is the mechanism by which administration on a regional level is performed. Detailed land use analysis and policy information is provided to the Metro Council through the Department with participation and feedback from residents. The Department also interprets and oversees the implementation of policies, provides technical assistance and training to local jurisdictions, and administers the Region's urban growth boundary. This boundary is intended to encompass an adequate supply of buildable land to accommodate growth over the next 20 years. The Department was given the authority to make local

governments change their plans if they conflicted with issues of regional significance. It is responsible for working with residents and local governments to plan for the next 50 years.

The Portland Metropolitan Region has been successful with its state-mandated urban growth boundary. Periodic reviews of the effectiveness of the boundary are conducted with input from residents. Although the Region can control development within their own boundary, they have no control over development happening outside their urban area. As increased growth pressure mounts in Portland, people who work in the Region are shifting to Vancouver, Washington where housing prices and development opportunities are more attractive.

Preparing for Future Growth

The Portland Metropolitan Region Council is continuing to revise and improve its state program for Growth Management. Its strategies include:

1. planning and promoting the efficient use of urban land
2. coordinating local and regional comprehensive plans to ensure consistency with statewide and regional planning goals
3. improving the efficiency of public facilities and services
4. providing farmland and forest land outside the urban growth boundary
5. planning for issues of metropolitan significance including transportation, air and water quality, and solid waste management

The Council also established an affordable housing policy with the State to ensure that as land became more scarce and expensive, a certain amount of housing would be allocated for lower and middle income residents.

In 1995 a complete overhaul of natural resource planning and an analysis of urbanization issues including a reassessment of the urban growth boundary was conducted. Three years before this a new State charter was established to move the Region toward a regionwide planning framework, including the establishment of a future vision commission to describe how the Region would accommodate growth while respecting the area's quality of life and sustainability. This became the basis for *The Metro 2040 Growth Concept*, the strategic plan for long term Growth Management in the Region until the year 2040.

The *2040* legislation was seen as a way to establish a 20 year land supply while preserving farmland. In 1997 Metro Council voted to add less than 13 square kilometres to Portland's existing urban growth boundary. If the Region sticks to its plan in the next 45 years only about six square kilometres of current farmland will be urbanized (this is about the same amount of farmland subdivided in

Michigan every 10 days). The legislation was designed to accommodate 750,000 more residents and 350,000 additional jobs. Its basic philosophy was to preserve access to nature and build better communities for the people who live there and in the future. The legislation applies state landuse requirements and sets direction for the development of implementing policies in Metro's existing plans and the Regional Framework Plan required by Metro's charter.

A concept map for *2040* shows approximately 22,000 acres of urban reserve study area and designates where it will be. The map assumes there will be cooperative agreements with neighbours to coordinate the planning of the projected growth of the area within the urban growth boundary and urban reserve areas. One of the keys of the *2040* legislation is highlighting mixed use urban centres. This is a combination of high density centres of employment and housing, and transit service, with compact development such as retail, recreational, and cultural activities within a pedestrian environment that is intended to provide efficient access to goods and services.

Under the *2040* legislation local governments were required to submit a package to the State on land use planning. A workbook was developed to guide local governments as they went through the planning process and to ensure that their plans complied with the new growth concept standards.

Reflections on Limiting Growth

Portland's Growth Management strategies have been an overall success. They are built on a long term understanding of planning and coordination activities and a consensus building model. The Region has realized many benefits from limiting growth within a set regional boundary. They showed that intelligent planning can maximize growth over the long term. Because Portland has preserved its quality of life and has not succumbed to urban sprawl, it has attracted major corporations such as Hewlett-Packard and Nike.

The Region achieved higher density within the City that has allowed for effective service delivery systems. Portland has one of the most usable Light Rail Transit and bus systems that help to limit traffic congestion and air pollution. The Region reacted quickly to a population explosion that brought employment and wage gains but also a 60% increase in housing prices by adopting a package of regulatory actions and incentives to increase the production of affordable housing.

Limiting the Region's urban growth boundary has forced investment inward. Planners and developers must seek new and innovative ways to accommodate housing development within the available land supply thereby minimizing the need for expansion. The Region has also focused on the economy and how the use of land will be integeral to the Region to solidify the competitiveness in a global

environment. A fostering of a more enlightened environmentalism that integrates social equity issues has also emerged.

Sources

Demographia, *Smart Growth Policies Make Portland Housing Less Affordable than Los Angeles* http://demographia.com/db-porahb0001.htm
ibid, *Portland not Sprawl Free*
ibid, *Saying No to Business Expansion: Portland Chooses to Create Gridlock*

Johnson, Curtis. Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Appendix A - Expert Interviews

Portland Metropolitan Region, *The 2040 Growth Concept*, www.metro-region/growth/tfplangconsum.html
ibid, *Growth Management*
ibid, *Livable Communities Workbook*
ibid, *Livable Communities Workshop*
ibid, *Myths and Realities*
ibid, *Metro Analysis of Regional Resources for Fish and Wildlife Protection*
ibid, *Regional Affordable Housing*

Porter, Doug. Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Appendix A - Expert Interviews

Sprawl Watch Clearinghouse, *Best Practices, Regional Governance: Portland*, www.sprawlwatch.org
ibid, *Ten Facts on the January 2000 Court of Appeals Ruling*
ibid, *The 2040 Framework Plan Summary*
ibid, *The Urban Growth Boundary and Periodic Review*
ibid, *2040 and You*
ibid, *Urban Growth Boundary*
ibid, *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*

Urban Futures, *Growth Management in the Portland Region and the Housing Boom of the 1990s* www.urbanfutures.org/wpgrowth.html

Wallis, Dr. Allan. Interviewed by Lara Pinchbeck, August 2000, Appendix A -Expert Interviews

Case Study #5 – Victoria, B.C.

Summary

A rapidly expanding population, the beginnings of the pattern of sprawl, and the need to comply with the Province's Growth Strategy Act prompted the Capital Regional District of Victoria (CRD) to develop a Regional Growth Strategy. The Region operates under a regional governance model where local governments work together as necessary to address common concerns. The Region, which encompasses the City of Victoria and 13 other municipalities, has a rapidly growing population. Currently, 600,000 people live in the CRD–more than half of them residing in the City of Victoria. By

2026 the region's population is expected to approach one million people.

Area Profile
Its moderate climate makes the Victoria region an increasingly popular home for retirees, naturalists, and outdoor enthusiasts. The area was judged one of the world's best centers for quality of life and environment.

Although the CRD's population has increased significantly over the past number of years, growth is expected to be slower over the next 30 years at approximately one percent per year compared to a two percent rate increase in the 1980s. Largely population increases are a result of a net migration of people from other provinces.

History of Growth
The provincial government established the Capital Regional District in 1996 because it recognized that some issues transcended municipal boundaries and there needed to be a mechanism to deal with local issues on a regionwide basis. The CRD governs parks, liquid and solid waste management, landfill, health facilities, regional planning, and regional growth.

Under the Province's Growth Strategy Act of 1995 municipalities were required to develop a Regional Growth Strategy that would include a common vision, goals, and regional priorities and strategies to manage growth and to enhance regional quality of life to the year 2026. The Strategy would address five areas: housing, transportation, regional district services, parks and natural areas, and economic development. Under the legislation, the Strategy must:

1. cover a period of 20 years
2. address social, environmental, and economic concerns
3. include population and employment projections
4. include a regional vision for the future
5. set out an agenda for action to meet these objectives

Each Regional Growth Strategy devised is considered a political agreement between a regional district and its member municipalities on social, economic and environmental goals, and priority actions. Official Community Plans, the main instruments for directing growth and land use in the regions, and Regional Green/Blue Spaces Strategies were existing documents the CRD used to develop its Regional Growth Strategy.

Developing a Regional Growth Strategy
The Capital Regional District began "Foundations for Our Future", its Regional Growth Strategy project in 1996. It involved setting regional priorities and developing common strategies about directing growth. The CRD's Regional Growth Strategy is based on the following four principles:

1. sustainability
2. appropriateness
3. continuity
4. cooperation, collaboration, and coordination

At the beginning of the process, the CRD considered questions such as:

1. what kind of region residents wanted in the future
2. what things residents held dear about the CRD and how they could be protected so they would be around in 30 years
3. how residents could make their region an even better place to live for all residents
4. how they could work cooperatively as municipalities to enhance the region as a whole while maintaining and enriching local identities

Through discussions with regional residents, ministries and agents of the government, First Nations, neighbouring jurisdictions, and member councils the CRD realized that collective actions needed to be taken to face future challenges, to preserve their present quality of life, and to maintain the region as beautiful for future generations. Particular values that the various groups held in common were a commitment to green space, natural corridors, and agricultural land protection.

Regional Growth Strategy Principles

After the consultation process the CRD identified six regional priorities that focused development and other approaches to the regional vision. They were:

1. managing and balancing growth
2. transportation
3. economic development
4. environment and resources
5. housing
6. social well being

Each priority area was broken down into an outline discussing what was implied under the division, what was the base information, where the information gaps were, and what challenges and opportunities needed to be explored. This complied information provided the basis for exploring other alternatives as well as acted as the focus for development within the region.

The following is one priority area broken down into this outline:

management and balancing growth

Within the CRD there is a physical limit which contains urban settlement while preserving rural renewable resources and green/blue space lands. The majority of any future population increase is to be

accommodated in Langford and Colwood with some infill and redevelopment in the Core municipalities.

what this division implies:

1. rural parts of municipalities in the Peninsula; Western Communities and Sooke experience stable to limited population increases
2. three employment centers: a major employment concentration in Langford and Colwood, limited center in the vicinity of Victoria International Airport and the Downtown Victoria/Town and Country Metropolitan Centre.

the base information:

By 2026, Georgia Basin Puget Sound Region is expected to add three million people. The population from the area of Campbell River to Olympia, Washington and east to Hope is expected to increase from approximately 6 million people in 1996 to approximately nine million people in 2026. Vancouver Island's population is forecast to increase from 600,000 to nearly one million.

Victoria Metropolitan population is expected to exceed 400,000 by 2026 from 315,000 in 1996. Growth is forecasted to be significantly lower over the next 30 years at approximately one percent per year compared to a two percent rate increase in the 1980s. This will largely result from net migration from other provinces. They are projecting that the death rate will actually exceed the birth rate. However, it will fluctuate and since future CRD rates of growth are unpredictable due to migration, it will be difficult to identify trends and make some sort of public policy and action correlated to actual rates of growth.

Current plans have capacity for 45,000 new dwellings. This theoretically represents 95% capacity of residential lands currently designated under idealic conditions

If current housing demands continue, housing capacity will be depleted by 2017, with land for single detached dwellings depleted by 2007. Some resultant factors are higher house prices or lifestyle changes. Therefore there is a need to look at other housing supplies thereby relieving some pressure and ensure affordable housing remains available. This could come with an increase in infill, secondary suites, mixed commercial residential development, compact development of new neighbourhoods, or changes in the Official Community Plans to convert other lands to residential use. There is adequate regional service capacity for the predicted needs to 2026 – the present water supply is from Sooke Dam watershed. The sanitary land fill and sewage treatment capacity are adequate to meet future growth.

New schools will need to be built in the Western Communities. Officials predict 10 schools will be needed to accommodate the expected 7500 to 10,000 students. The Victoria School District is expecting stable enrollment over the next 25 years and expect to increase from 80-85% of existing capacity. Saanich expects to see a declining in enrollment that is currently at 96% capacity.

the information gaps – things not known:

1. What level of confidence can be placed on forecast population increases in particular assumptions regarding net population migration increases? Net migration from other provinces is unpredictable.
2. What are the different implications of high, medium and low population forecasts for the rate of residential capacity depletion? What are the resultant forms of housing that should be considered?
3. To what extent do all the forecast depletion in residential land supply and resultant residential housing costs reduce net migration?
4. If the apparent shortage of residential land supply is real, are there other factors that may exist that will either significantly decrease or increase the apparent shortage?
5. How efficiently will residential land actually be developed? It may not be safe to assume that developments can be build to 95% capacity. Is this a number attainable only under best case scenarios?
6. How will possible future development on Federal or First Nations lands affect the envisioned settlement pattern?
7. What finite carrying capacities of land, water, and air exist and can be used as tools to manage growth? There still need to mechanisms introduced to accurately measure.

the challenges and opportunities:

1. How can the collective vision manage and anticipate change within limits in ways that will enhance the quality of life rather than reacting to population forecasts or to actual population growth?
2. Should the rate of growth be managed? These principles may try to change the population's housing preferences, increase viable transportation alternatives, place firm physical limits on regional growth and development or find new lands within or outside the region where growth can be directed. What are the implications of these alternatives?
3. The population in the CRD could increase faster than forecast depending on economic and other conditions outside the CRD. How should completely uncontrollable growth be managed if higher than forecasted rates occur?
4. Should forecast population increases be directed to support the development of town centers within Colwood and Langford and enhance the vitality of existing urban centres thereby keeping to

the overall regional plan? Are there key pieces of public investment that need to occur to support the process?

5. The CRD has a limited supply of land for urban settlement based *on topological features. Current housing and transportation* preferences favour a low density, sprawling settlement pattern that would use up lands designated for urban development early in the next century.
6. What can be one way of settlement and transportation planning to more effectively manage this limited resource for long term benefit? What measures should be taken to ensure that the integrity of the regional vision endures beyond the 25 year horizon of the RGS?
7. Forecast population increases may place unequal demands on communities to accommodate growth. Should this inequity be addressed along with the ability to address regional growth particularly for infrastructure such as schools?
8. Existing First Nations reserve lands have significant potential for urban development and the long term success of any strategy to manage and balance regional growth must take these lands into account. Without active participation of First Nations councils, how does the RGS manage future development concerns on First Nations land?

Similar outlines were done for each of the other priority areas: transportation, economic development, environment and resources, housing, and social well being.

These principles guided alternative approaches to development.

Criteria were also identified for evaluating the effectiveness of the Regional Growth Strategy. They include:

1. the character of the region and each community's unique identity, character and role in the region is recognized and preserved
2. supplies of stable land, infrastructure and resources are provided to accommodate preferred future settlement
3. transportation infrastructure for all modes adequately and safely serves the region
4. the economy is strong and diverse
5. economic development activities support a wide range of business activity in a wide range of sectors and developing new ones consistent with the regional vision
6. a wide range of employment opportunities are available for residents
7. employment centers as identified in the regional vision are supported
8. the arts and culture and sports communities are supported as a significant contributor to the local economy
9. the completeness of the region's communities is enhanced
10. community health and stability is maintained and enhanced

11. housing is available to meet the needs of residents
12. core green and blue space areas are protected and maintained
13. risks to life and property associated with natural hazards are minimized
14. the quality and quantity of water resources is protected
15. renewable and non-renewable natural resources are conserved and stewarded
16. air, land, and water pollution is reduced
17. implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy alternative is affordable to the public and all affected levels of government
18. the implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy alternative is practical within the time identified

In another consultative process a broadbased group of stakeholders were asked to consider the Regional Growth Strategy principles and from them alternative models were created to realize the principles.

The adopted Alternative was to:
1. identify the scope, vision, and priority for the Regional Growth Strategy
2. guide planning, servicing, and development policy for municipal counties, the regional board, and other public decision makers in the Capital Regional District

In addition, the development and evaluation of the Alternative was to respect the following 14 provincial goals set out in the Growth Strategies Act:
1. avoiding urban sprawl
2. minimizing auto use and encourage walking, cycling and efficient transportation
3. moving goods and people efficiently making effective use of transportation and utility corridors
4. protecting environmentally sensitive areas
5. maintaining a secure and protected resource base
6. encouraging economic development that supports the unique character of communities
7. preventing and reducing air, land and water pollution
8. ensuring adequate and affordable housing
9. ensuring adequate inventories of suitable land and resources for future development
10. protecting the quality and quantity of ground and surface water
11. minimizing the risks to settlements associated with natural hazards
12. preserving, creating, and linking rural and urban open space including parks and recreational areas
13. promoting efficient use, conservation and alternative sources of energy
14. ensuring good stewardship of land site structures with cultural heritage and values

The process used to guide the design and development of the Growth Strategy Alternative was started after the Regional Growth Strategy framework was tabled in 1998. Citizen volunteers went through the following steps:

1. identified growth strategy policy directions
2. identified 12 growth strategy alternative concepts
3. selected 4 growth strategy alternatives
4. prepared a draft report and reviewed it
5. revised the draft and published it as a proposed Strategy Alternatives Report
6. finalized and adopted the Growth Strategies Alternative

Evaluation criteria categories included environment and resources, enhanced quality of life, and implementation.

A list of objectives for the Alternative:

1. to keep urban growth compact and within physical limits
2. to reduce the reliance on the private automobile by changing automobile dependent development settlement patterns and by increasing transportation choices
3. to increase infill and to redevelop in the core municipalities and create more complete communities
4. to use the limited supply of developable land more efficiently
5. to make better use of existing public infrastructure
6. to take steps to support a vibrant regional economy
7. to protect and restore valuable ecosystems and renewable resource lands
8. to ensure an adequate supply of affordable housing
9. to enhance a sense of community identity
10. to prevent the following outcomes:
    a. expansion of urban areas into rural countryside and other sensitive areas
    b. ongoing subdivision and loss of the agricultural, forest, resource and environmentally sensitive land base
    c. increased reliance for the private automobile for transportation beyond its current 80% share of total trips in the region
    d. deterioration of mobility due to traffic congestion
    e. erosion of downtown Victoria's as the region's primary employment and cultural center
    f. under use of existing public investment in infrastructure and services and the inefficient future extension of these services
    g. further narrowing of the region's economic base over time
    h. increasingly unaffordable housing
    i. increased sense of personal insecurity and loss of community identity

The models that were proposed under the Growth Strategy Alternative were:

1. a **Base Strategy** - rural protection and urban containment to efficiently achieve the current development capacities in the Official Community Plans with:
2. **Metropolitan Core and major centers** – new growth directed to downtown Victoria and 11 other existing major centers, or
3. **Transit Linked Towns** – development is concentrated in designated mixed use complete communities along a high capacity transit corridor, or
4. **Hierarchy of Walkable Centers** – new growth is directed to pedestrian oriented villages and larger centers throughout the region

Nine strategic elements common to the Alternative arose from the process:

1. urban containment and rural protection
2. green/blue space protection
3. more complete communities
4. balanced regional transportation
5. stronger regional economy
6. improved housing affordability
7. interjurisdictional growth management
8. coordinated infrastructure and servicing
9. progress monitoring

Future Directions

The process looks forward to the year 2026. Through monitoring and reporting on its implementation it can be updated every five years.

Sources

Capital Regional District, Framework for Our Future, www.crd.bc.ca
ibid, *Development of the Growth Strategy Alternatives for the Capital Region (December 1999)*

Case Study #6 – The State of Minnesota

The State of Minnesota recently developed a Growth Management framework called *Ventura Smart Growth Initiative: Growing Smart in Minnesota*. The following excerpt (Ventura, 1999) lays out the process the State followed.

Framework for Action

The question the State addressed was: "How can we grow in ways that improve the prosperity and quality of life for all as Minnesota competes in the knowledge, service-based, and just-in-time economy of the 21st Century?"

The context for Smart Growth was: "maximizing economic opportunity, connecting people to housing, transportation, and jobs,...protect and enhance the environment and other assets that keep communities attractive, places to live and work."

They defined under Smart Growth what will grow: jobs, productivity, wages, education, housing opportunities, savings, profits, opportunity, and knowledge and what will not grow: pollution, waste, and poverty.

Goals of the Smart Growth Initiatives:

- maximize economic opportunity for all while protecting and enhancing the assets that make Minnesota a great place to live – healthy communities, clean air and water, and Minnesota's unique natural, cultural, and historic areas
- manage natural resources and agricultural land to ensure they are sustained for future generations
- be fiscally prudent by building on existing public investments and avoiding future costs down the road

Responsibilities of the State

- The State must listen to citizens, businesses, and local governments and encourage their participation and involvement at the local level by deciding what Smart Growth will look like in their community.
- The State must be consistent. Minnesota needs to cut out the mixed signals, policies, and investments that encourage short sighted growth and realign its policies, resources, and incentives to foster Smart Growth. In addition Minnesota needs to evaluate and realign state regulations so they deter activities contrary to Smart Growth principles and promote activities consist with these principles.
- The State needs to support communities as they pursue Smart Growth strategies. The State should offer incentives rather than top down mandates and support local governments around the state that make Sustainable Development Choices.

Principles for Success

These common sense principles will guide public decisions and achieve results Minnesotans expect.

- Stewardship: use land and natural resources wisely to sustain them for the future.
- Efficiency: make more efficient integrated public investments in transportation, housing, schools, utilities, information infrastructure, and other public services.
- Choice: give communities Smart Growth options and choices.
- Accountability: reinforce responsibility and accountability for development decisions.

Strategies for Smart Growth in Minnesota

Strategy One: Engage citizens in planning and decision making.

Minnesota needs an active informed citizenry and business community participating in planning and decision making at the local level. The State will partner with local governments, business groups, civic organizations and others to:

- engage citizens in defining what Smart Growth looks like and assessing the costs and consequences to development alternatives through visualization preference surveys, community dialogues, forums, and other tools;
- promote better coordination and communication with state, local and regional interests on planning and development through comprehensive planning; and
- continue to provide citizens with comprehensive planning choices and conduct an independent analysis of planning frameworks as the basis of future changes to planning acts.

Strategy Two: Position and align state government for Smart Growth.

Minnesota must align its initiatives with its goals: linking investments and policies for transportation, housing, economic development, environmental protection, and natural resources management so that they encourage economic opportunity while sustaining Minnesota's quality of life.

To accomplish this the Smart Growth Initiative will:

- inventory current state government policies, initiatives and resources to determine how they work for or against Smart Growth
- work with the Tax Reform Project to evaluate necessary changes to the tax system to promote Smart Growth
- reform other state initiatives and policies to reinforce state Smart Growth principles ensuring consistency between transportation and other infrastructure investments and land use plans
- create a flexible state development strategy and support regional strategies that link investments and policies to:
  - reflect the needs and preferences of citizens, communities, and businesses
  - conserve Minnesota's farms, farmlands, greenways, and other natural resources
  - tie public investments to Smart Growth plans
- create a system of greenways throughout the state, build on collaborative public/private partnerships and voluntary approaches with minimal land acquisition
- develop tools for reviewing major statewide spending and bonding bills to assess how well new state investments promote Smart Growth
- develop Smart Growth indicators that demonstrate our progress and success

Strategy Three: Provide communities with effective tools for Smart Growth.

Local governments are bringing Smart Growth principles into reality with innovative new development and zoning policies. It is up to

local governments and regional organizations, with the substantive participation of citizens, to decide what Smart Growth will look like in each community.

To accomplish this, Minnesota will:

- change the way the State does business to provide integrated, responsive service to communities
- provide communities with better tools and assistance for evaluating the costs and consequences of development decisions and more effective incentives for incorporating Smart Growth principles into planning and development
- strengthen and improve tools for agricultural land preservation
- identify those areas of urban life and development where a better understanding is needed and develop that understanding through the Urban Development Generic Environmental Impact Statement.

Appendix A – Expert Interviews

Curtis Johnson

Curtis Johnson is a leader in governance, having spent four years (1995-1999) as the Board Chair of the Metropolitan Council in Minneapolis /St. Paul. Mr. Johnson is also an independent journalist and commentator on metropolitan issues in regions around the United States and the world. He is currently at work on a series of articles on growth management, economic strategy, and their cultural opportunities in south Florida.

Talk about different patterns of growth management.
The idea for growth management is coming from the state government. Over the last 25 years many places wrote good laws, but have not funded them well such as Florida and Georgia.

In the last five years some places have become more aggressive. All of them are coming at it from different angles. New Jersey has a complex incentive structure for building more compactly. They agreed to set aside half of what is left for land in their state for conservation reasons. Maryland took a market incentive approach. The State said there was a public interest in not encouraging development to go where we don't have infrastructure to support it and where we would incur a liability to build and maintain infrastructure where we don't want to have it. Telling developers that they will pay for everything that will have to be put there (schools, roads, etc) puts the responsibility for funding on the developers' backs. This has had a measurable effect for dampening the market for development. It is beginning to have an effect and they are beginning to refine their laws to make them work better.

Atlanta, Georgia is a successful place by any conventional measure, but it is an example of growth run wild. It has gone from a compact metropolitan area to one that is 100 miles from top to bottom. Citizen commutes set world records.

The federal environmental department cut them off for federal funding for transportation. They had to make the air more breathable before they would get more funding.

The business community voiced concerns over long commute times. Hewlett Packard cancelled an expansion project because the City was becoming an unlivable place for their workers. The business community got organized and developed a report on how to manage growth. Chamber of Commerce, government, and environmental organizations got together and formed a new regional agency appointed by the Governor that would have authority to make transportation decisions for 13 counties.

They could compel the government to redo its comprehensive plans, to determine where transit is going to get extended. It is a powerful regional agency. This was a radical response to a critical situation. The agency is less than a year old but it is attracting a lot of attention. It was a radical tactical response to a critical problem.

Oregon took a long-term, proactive approach to growth 25 years ago. The agricultural centres did not want good soil to be taken over by

urban interests. They passed the country's strongest most complex, comprehensive growth management law and created a department in state government to give it teeth. It prescribed growth boundaries. It is still a land mark law although it did not work perfectly.

Portland is now one of the most desirable places to live in the world. Housing prices are good. Downtown Portland may be the most successful downtown in the country. It is a 24 hour city, walkable, with a mixture of housing, stores, and offices.

This type of planning is not replicated much because it doesn't fit every city's culture. It drew lines about where they don't ever want growth (open space, wetlands, etc). The challenge is to build real communities. We build subdivisions but very few real communities. There is a lot of retrofitting going on now. People are trying to find a town centre and carve it out - squares, human scale stores instead of big box.

Growth management technicians make real places, put buffers between them to distinguish them.

In Phoenix people would build in the desert (this is called leap frogging) where no infrastructure existed. As a result traffic in metropolitan areas is a huge concern.

In the US there is no regular and logical place to make a decision about growth management. The only regional government is in Portland and Minneapolis/St. Paul.

Talk about the tools of growth management
Council of governance is voluntary, practically mandatory because they need them to process federal transportation funds, they just discuss issues but don't get anything done.

Metropolitan planning organizations (Charlotte, South Florida) – these decide on transportation issues

Are they dealing with growth management as a crisis issue or proactively?
There is no place that anyone has been farsighted. In most places, something has precipitated growth management. For Denver it was the air quality – had to put fewer cars on the road, no wood burning stoves. Pieces of regional governance are showing up all over the place. They are keeping it under the political radar so no one gets upset, ad hoc (Denver a good example of this).

There is no planning and no communicating between ad hoc regional groups. They need to have leaders who know what is going on and who can bring people together. These leaders emerge – arousal of the business community is an example of this. They understand the

market they are in so they are trying to push the politicians to do something that makes sense for the community, and its quality of life.

Silicon Valley has attracted tech minds but is beginning to lose them now because homes are expensive and it is very hard to get around. People are looking at other places that have a better quality of life.

Austin-San Antonio council is made up of business leaders, community activists and government officials. They are getting together to channel and control growth.

Chicago had lots of community activists, churches, organized labour, and business leaders get together to form a coalition – all sat around the same table and they all agreed on a plan to manage growth. They are now in the first stages of trying to implement it.

Minneapolis/St. Paul has a Metro Council appointed by the Governor (Portland's is elected). It has the power to regulate land use, all counties have to have comprehensive plans that must be consistent with the regional plan, the council runs the transit, waste water treatment, parks and open space, approves capital budget of airport authority. There has been a debate since 1967 about whether it should be appointed (keeps governor accountable) or elected body (who wants another layer of elected officials? makes it more democratic, would make regional issues more visible).

Growth Management

Regions can save a couple of billion dollars by keeping growth orderly and contiguous and to make sure that it is synchronized with adequate infrastructure.

The Sierra Club has said that Minneapolis/St. Paul are in the top ten of cities with sprawl problems.

Portland council is a directly elected body that has more teeth on land use issues. They look at economic and social issues but have no responsibility to do anything about it. They keep the region competitive. Unemployment rate is less than 2%.

The Twin Cities have found the formula for where to locate services that are delivered on a regional scale – waste water, transportation, road money. It has a structure where nobody can tell anyone else what to do. If you are going to get anything done, it has to be done by good politics. It has to be done by consensus.

Will it evolve?

There may be a push to making it a stronger player in providing affordable housing. This is how it is run – with property taxes, fare box money, appropriation by state legislature, and some federal funds.

Florida is at ground zero for figuring out what do you do when you run out of space and can't move people from point a to point b. They have a bad transit system – it is all questions and no answers at this point.

Another million people will end up there in the next five years. They have a state growth management plan – some parts have worked, but it never got funded well.

Local plans that are in compliance with state plans – done sporadically, there is no money for it. The Governor appointed his own commission to look at growth management issues. They have just started meeting.

Are there ideas that people have determined that should not be delivered under growth management models?
Some but it is not widely debated. Things should be delivered at the lowest, simplest level – closest to the people. What is changing the politics of people on these issues is what is happening in the technology of visualization.

Secondary interview with Curtis Johnson

What is the distinction between growth management and Smart Growth?
You are raising one of the issues that's constantly nipping at the heels of people working on the challenge of growth. What seems to happen, at least politically, that one of these terms becomes the vogue, and then after a term of being pushed promotionally by advocates and abused royally by critics, it seems to collect so much baggage it's not useful any longer. That may be happening to "Smart Growth." Though it still seems to have some panache -- the high ground, as it were. I remember Ted Turner (CNN founder) ridiculing it at a conference in Atlanta, then acknowledging that it had to be better than "Dumb Growth." Certainly, it's terminological predecessor, "growth management" -- with its roots in papers written by academics and planners, seems hopelessly bland at best, and maybe smells to the suspicious like social engineering plots.

To me, "Sustainability" --- despite its leftist implications in some circles -- is broader. It reaches out for more than land use and transportation; a bigger agenda than redevelopment of urban centers, though that is part of the thinking. It touches the ecological vein -- getting the discussion to how to restore enough balance to make the environment safe for our grandchildren, without using up all the planet's natural resources.

"Sustainable" also reaches for the social challenge; a society, however hot the economy may be, that drifts further into racial and economic divisions, that doesn't nourish opportunities for everyone

and work on connections across divides, isn't going to last. And Toynbee will be right, again.

I think the overall challenge is to set a context and tone that escapes the easy compartmentalization people want to practice on this agenda. Its biggest liability ironically seems to be a sense that it's just for liberals. I would argue strongly that "Sustainability" and "Smarter Growth" strategies are fundamentally conservative: they hold on to assets we want to protect; they save money that we will otherwise squander in keeping up with an infrastructure larger than we really need; they restore the balance of investment that keeps our urban core from dragging us down with high crime and social costs; they ensure that our regions can be competitive places. What's more "conservative" than all that?

Doug Porter

Douglas R. Porter is President of the Growth Management Institute based in Chevy Chase, Maryland. He is author of 'Managing Growth in America's Communities'.

What are some theoretical models of growth management?
Growth management is often seen as a control or anti-growth management tool. My outlook on growth management is broader. I look at growth management as taking planning through the implementation phase. Managing growth can be positive planning that provide information for people in development, whether public or private, that can help them make decisions about where and how they should grow.

For instance, a lot of growth management tools have to do with providing infrastructure in a reasonable and timely way for development. There are plenty of growth management tools that are seen as onerous by developers who feel they are being limited or constrained but which are reaching to public objectives that are positive and constructive.

What has been highlighted in many growth management programs have been things that try to direct development to certain areas. That require that development be served by infrastructure, that try to control the quality of that development so that it doesn't harm or further harm things like air and water quality.

There are a whole variety of tools to use to manage growth. Some of them are tax incentives or penalties, some are direct linkages between the requirements for open spaces or environmental preservation for provision of roads and schools and libraries, and some have to do with the character, quality and design of development. None of these tools work individually. We know from experience that things like urban growth boundaries are difficult to administer and are very complicated. They also don't work by themselves to control sprawl. They are not the answer. Educating the public is probably a growth management tool as well.

Market driven is also a favorite term. It is supposed to be a way to influence the market to do what you want it to do. Developers will tell you that they like to have incentives for doing the right thing. So often they feel they are given disincentives and prevented from doing the things they want to do. Market driven is a phrase that can be useful, there are many things that you can load into the development process—allowing flexibility in the choice of housing and things like that.

What about the public education aspect?
It's an absolute necessity. The public is usually about 10-15 years behind where we need to be. That's because professionals are just now starting to recognize that some of the things they did 10 years ago is not the wisest. That's about the same time that the public gets caught up in that issue.

Is it beneficial to include the public in the whole process?
It's an absolute necessity, time consuming, complicated, and conflicting because people don't like change. The people who take the time to work with public groups, bring them along can learn from them. They will also be the ones who build a base of consensus that is needed to make these things happen. At the same time, there have been examples of planners going overboard with this process and completely nullifying it. Leadership is very important in the political and professional area. Having ideas, pursuing ideas and finding ways to make them applicable in real life is absolutely important.

Where can leadership come from?
It should come from the public groups that have become educated. We need people who know how to market ideas and that can come up with things that are immediately accessible to people.

What kind of scope should growth management encompass?
I think it has to look at everything--economics, environmental consequences, and social concerns. We don't know how they work together but we do know that one will affect the other. It is absolutely critical to think comprehensively.

When you are talking about service delivery, there are many models around regional service delivery like transportation, water and sewer, and waste management.

Many of the regional organizations around the country that have been successful are the ones that everyone is willing to say that these services are regional in scale.

For example, Minneapolis/St. Paul's Twin City Council was formed because they needed regional sewer service and then expanded to be part of other commissions and boards that were making decisions that affected the region.

In the Washington time we have a difficult time getting regional cooperation. We do have a regional transit and airport system. We also have some regional sewer and water systems. Those things seem to be easier to do and get support for on a regional level rather than things like regional zoning.

What the public thinks about regionalism is that it is something that you are going to have to give up and not be able to control in your own local government. If giving up something looked like it was actually going to gain you something you might be more willing to do it. You wouldn't be losing your sovereignty.

Where do you think growth management is going? To sustainability?
In smaller communities you can generate a constituency for Sustainable Development. In places of 10,000 to 90,000 people. They are typically university towns. Larger areas cannot be penetrated. Smart Growth has caught on as an idea now.

Is it too large of a concept for people to get their heads around?
Yes.

If you are thinking about doing regional planning, the smartest thing you can do is identify the spaces that need to be preserved against the spaces that could be developed. That's what urban growth boundaries are supposed to do but they do it in a very roughhewn way. Maricopa County in Phoenix has done this. They mapped open spaces and identified the values of those places. What that did is provide priorities for areas that should be preserved at any cost with areas that should be preserved if you can and other areas that can be developed.

Around metropolitan areas that are growing there may be limits to just how far you can go. The most useful thing we can do at a regional level is to decide where to grow and where not to grow on a very basic level. That would be a huge step ahead in letting local governments and developers know where they are likely to get support or not get support. And yet we haven't even managed to get to that point in most regions.

Secondary interview with Doug Porter

How do you distinguish growth management and Smart Growth?
Trying to sort out the differences between Smart Growth, Sustainable Development, and growth management is daunting. I give it a try in my just-about-to-be-published "The Practice of Sustainable Development." Sustainable Development emphasizes the importance of sustaining environmental qualities, but gives a bow to maintaining and upgrading economic activities and making social advances.

Sustainability was initiated as an environmental concern and remains very focused on maintaining the environment and worrying about concerns like global warming, loss of farmland and species, etc. At the local level, these translate into air and water quality issues, reductions in use of irreplaceable resources, and recycling of replaceable ones. At the same time, sustainability should keep the human part of the environment in mind and balance concerns for human advancement and maintenance -- a tall order.

Smart Growth, on the other hand, began basically as a concern for how cities grow -- pushed by environmental groups worried about farmland loss, and air and water quality but also by groups concerned with affordable housing, infrastructure investments, traffic and schools, etc. It has less of an environmental focus.

Growth management, in my terms, at least, provides approaches and techniques for accomplishing the aims of Sustainable Development and Smart Growth. It includes visioning the future community, making concrete plans to advance the quality of future growth, and managing the growth process. It includes physical, economic, and social concerns. The objectives of growth management, as phrased in countless comprehensive plans throughout the nation, look remarkably like the objectives of Smart Growth. The difference is that Smart Growth posts a set of general objectives that every community must translate into more specific actions according to its particular interests, conditions, and opportunities. That's a rather labored effort to distinguish among terms that seem to be coalescing to some degree.

Dr. Allan Wallis

Dr. Allan Wallis is an Associate Professor of Public Policy at the University of Colorado where he directs a program in local government and teaches a course on Growth Management. Dr. Wallis is also author of a monograph on implementing Florida's 1985 Growth Management act. He has also published an article on collaborative regionalism that focuses on development of a voluntary growth boundary in the Denver, Colorado metropolitan area. Dr. Wallis is currently looking at collaborative approaches to regionalism, including Growth Management.

History of growth management

We have an early tradition of regulating land that is called zoning – this is a two-dimensional response to dealing with patterns of development. In the U.S. we started seeing zoning before WWI and it spread across the country after the war. When the U.S. faced rapid urbanization after WWII (zoning is the basic mechanism) we started to run into problems as concerns over preservation of the environmental quality came up at one end and social equity issues of the preservation of neighbourhoods came up at the other end.

Zoning by the 1970s was no longer seen as an adequate solution. It was designed to address a particular set of problems that existed, but an entirely different set of problems had been added. Social equity problems, and especially new environmental concerns. We start to see the emergence of a new idea not in the first place growth management, but growth control in the late 1960s and 1970s. Petaluma, California was one of the first cities to institute a growth cap (a cap on its population). The City limited the number of housing permits it would issue. It came up with a targetted future population

and issued permits in proportion between now and the targetted year to reach growth.

This is known as the Petaluma Plan. The City Manager who helped implement it was hired by Boulder to institute a form of this Plan called the Danish Plan. This Plan did the same thing as Petaluma, but they found that because of legal constraints they could not implement a target population limit. Both of these plans are still in operation.

Are they still seen as effective or do they need to be adapted in some way?
In Boulder, the City is built up (the target year was 2000). It has no vacant lots. Lot prices are extremely high. Implementing growth limits helped the City preserve a high quality of life and to maintain the quality of the environment (green belt). Because Boulder need not take its allocation of the region's growth, the growth that would have occurred there simply spilled over into the surrounding counties. Adjacent communities which had small populations literally exploded going from a small population of 100 to 5000 in 5 years. Growth Management was successful locally, but its impact on the surrounding county was that it displaced growth.

Would it have been important to have a plan that dealt with region wide issues of growth?
Exactly. Now Boulder is trying to develop growth patterns with surrounding communities. Boulder capped residential growth but did not want to cap commercial growth. In Boulder today there is a job-housing imbalance. One job for every resident. There area a huge number of cars entering and leaving the City each day. By only controlling one aspect of growth the consequence over 25 years was to achieve defined goals but produce imbalance in other areas that were not being considered. These are now significantly undermining the quality of life in the community with air pollution, traffic, etc.

By controlling growth at the municipal level, they focused on a single aspect of growth. Just controlling one thing does not do it. You need a more holistic approach–considering many aspects and looking at it on a regional basis.

Growth management developed in the 1980s It meant to signal that the purpose is not to put a cap on anything but to look at a way that the components of growth can work together in a coordinated fashion managing downside as well as upside. Growth controls were put in when the economy was strong and people were concerned about rapid increases in population. When the economy turned soft there was an equally strong public concern to get rid of those controls.

Washington passed a growth management act in 1991. Members of the state legislature who were from rural areas where there was little growth had no interest in a growth management plan. Oregon

exempted rural areas and made their growth management strategies apply to metro areas only.

Florida is another state that implemented growth management in the 1970s. Eight out of 50 states have required growth management strategies. Many states have growth management triggered to particular areas. They don't cover the entire state. Some of them are focused on areas of critical state interests (environmentally sensitive areas). About one third of the states have growth management measures of some sort.

The federal government does not deal with land use issues. It has the Environmental Protection Act and Clean Water and Air legislation.

What kind of credibility do these federal requirements have?
Certainly federal funds could be withheld or reduced if they were not followed. However, often state environmental laws are even more stringent that federal requirements.

Current trends in growth management
Sustainable growth is the latest evolution of approaches. It is not widely embraced in the U.S. Sustainable growth looks at the issues of growth as an integrated system. There are three key elements: environment, economy, and social equity (a weak element). Balancing economic development with environmental sustainability is the main focus. It looks at the long term impact of development on the environment. It is more comprehensive in terms of time on a region-wide scale.

How can a region's self-sustainability be balanced with their desire to be involved in globalization?
As globalization began to occur large corporations said that we operate on a region wide basis. Silicon Valley is a good example of this. In the late 1980s and early 1990s the area experienced a pull back in the computer industry. The key manufacturers formed a non-profit group that developed a vision for the Valley and began to issue reports that benchmarked their vision. This process is coming out of the private sector. They perceive themselves as being part of the global economy but they see their success in achieving a successful region. This regionalism is tied with economy and quality of environment. The private sector became great advocates of regional scale planning. Idea that regions are important in planning because regions are large enough to have spill over effects but small enough for people to have a sense that they do live in a region and that their voices do make a difference.

Some of regionalism's strongest advocacy is coming from the private/corporate sector, public sector and non-profit.

Critical to this must be the process that everyone is working to achieve regionalism. It is much more process oriented (strategic

planning, visioning, targeted campaigns to achieve specific things) and much less interested in structures that would create government at the regional level.

Are these voluntary relationships that are being built?
They are largely voluntary. There are a variety of motivations for this. There is some form of perceived threat that state government would impose it, so they created a voluntary system at the regional level. The other motivating force is what is required to be competitive in the global environment (if we can't figure out how to work together we will sink together). Both of these forces are working to fuel the new regionalism.

What kind of time frame, resources, and collaborative mechanism are in place for this?
There is no one pattern being used. Independent invention is used in each place due to difference in political culture. In some cases private sector in others public sector.

These collaborations occur before crisis mode hits?
Exactly. Interests around getting a new airport or seaport in place. This means that more comprehensive changes put into place. A lot of these efforts are extremely strategic. The overall framework takes the form of a vision (like Silicon Valley) and then they strategically implement a few elements of that vision that will create a sense of regional identity.

Is there a structure to these collaborations?
It varies. Some are adopted because of a need. Some are adopted to create a capacity that did not exist. In the Denver Metro area there is an existing structure that was adapted to a new need. They just signed a growth management compact to implement a growth boundary in the area over the next 20 years. The council of governance was created to meet federal requirements from the 1970s. It is a membership organization (voluntary) that includes municipal and county governments with weighted voting – does a lot of planning activities.

Citizens concerned with growth were putting issues on the ballots (pressure to do something about growth). This has created some turmoil. They needed to show some leadership and make it more orderly. The planning process began five years ago and now everyone is signing on to it. It employs existing state powers.

Other places where new entities have been created can be regional level authorities (Dayton, Ohio and Marion county). Old economy and unemployment and economic redevelopment are huge issues. Designed revenue sharing mechanism. Started out as a voluntary group, then went to the state to get authority to carry out what was needed to be done.

Are these in general metropolitan areas or more regional areas?
It is also occurring in essentially rural areas. There is not a lot of literature on this. The area around Pittsburg. Pittsburg has been successful in turning around its economy but the region has not.

What about a region made up of a strong metropolitan area and a strong surrounding rural area where the metropolitan area does not want to be involved in regional collaboration?
Collaboration requires strategic identification of enlightened self-interest. It has got to be strategically posed so that both sides see a benefit. Areas where both see themselves having a shared interest area are often issues of water. Other areas of cooperation are preventing urban sprawl from chewing up the environment (Idaho has tried to balance rural agriculture interests with urban interests where they see sprawl as a direct threat to the agricultural economy).

You mentioned that collaborative approach to regionalism is new. Can you predict how it might evolve?
Following WWI, urban and suburban areas faced a period of rapid expansion due to cheap autos and the need to be surrounded by your own grass. New suburbs sprang up virtually overnight. There was a need to govern these new entities. A council-manager form of government was adopted by 80% of municipalities in the U.S. by the 1950s. It was easy to understand and easy to adopt and put into place. There was a broad identification of a problem, simultaneous recognition that existing solutions were inadequate to deal with the problem, the flowering of invention, the falling out of weaker ones and rising up of stronger solutions, and a wide spread action of one of more advocacy groups to disseminate the innovation.

If we are now facing a set of problems that are new and that people perceive that the old systems of government are inadequate to address, and the scope and complexity are beyond the existing mechanism of government now that we recognize the problem, what do we do about it?
We have not arrived at a sense that any of these solutions is superior to the other. Whatever solution comes out it will have these characteristics – a multi sector collaborative effort. It could be regional councils that will have memberships from these interests. There will be increased pressure on states that will create structures whose directions will be in regional planning and regional thinking.

There will be a focus on the economy and how the use of land will be much more integral to the economy being competitive in a global environment.

We are seeing a more enlightened environmentalism that integrates social equity issues. Where we are seeing this is in seeing how strengthening at a regional level strengthens at a neighbourhood level.

What is the role of public in this and does that link to the neighbourhood level?
The people most concerned about quality of place because they live there. Cookie cutter suburbs are an example of this. They are totally uniform, completely indifferent to the quality of place. How important is place? landscape, uniqueness of place, quality of community. In the new regionalism – role of place and stewardship of place is not addressed.

How are local citizen interests addressed at a regional level?
They must have some form of representative government, some form of council. In many metro regions, school districts are direct representation but only by single issue schools. Transportation, water, sewer – are single issue governance due to legal issues – they do not talk to each other because it could be perceived that they would be acting like a general purpose government.

You could create a regional civic organization that would act as the voice of the citizens, create a platform for dialogue--some strong, some weak.

Representation around single purposes
Citizen bodies – independent , but not integrated around the whole planning stage. In some cases, yes, in others no. Florida has mandatory growth management planning. Citizen groups have standing to question if modifications to the plan are a violation of the intent of the plan. When plan put in place in Coco Beach citizens were involved as part of a historic neighbourhood issue. When the City submitted its plan it didn't embody the concern of the community and would instead embrace the developer's plan. A neighbourhood group appealed to the state and the state agreed and forced the City to modify its plan and reject the development proposal. This citizen group was totally voluntary with a level of responsibility built in. The reward for being responsible is that they can monitor the process and request changes in decisions.

If you are creating at a regional level you also have to create at a neighbourhood level. Trust is a huge issue. Distrust between the central city and suburbs and distrust between suburbs is a huge issue in regionalism. Based on a balancing of rights and responsibilities.

Economic relationships are based on trust, not just on power. Municipalities are designed to be competitive entities, working against the other to capture new tax base.

Florida is one of the strongest states in terms of traditional growth management. There is a huge bureaucracy at the state level to carry these strategies out. There are hugely powerful environmental controls (federal). Currently the state government is pushing growth management to a regional level. South Florida (Miami, Palm Beach,

Fort Lauderdale) are trying to develop a collaborative approach to growth management. If they can act more effectively regionally they will be in a better position to capture state funds for this process.

There is an awareness that the rules of the game have changed.

How effective was the old system?
It protected the most fragile and endangered lands. It was successful because of a huge federal presence. Also, with patterns of development Florida has not achieved any less sprawl than any area that hasn't had a state wide growth management plan.

The Florida program deals with environmental issues.

What about economics and social issues?
These did not come into play. Environment and infrastructure were the two issues. Although the state has added an affordable housing component. Individual counties have tried to tie schools into this. Most capital funding goes to suburbs while inner city schools crumble.

Secondary Interview with Dr. Allan Wallis

How do you distinguish growth management and Smart Growth?
Growth management came into use in the 1980s as a way of conveying a different emphasis than growth control. The latter conveys the image of capping growth or in some other way limiting it. "Management" suggests allowing growth to occur in an orderly fashion. Advocates of managed growth also talk about dealing with the down as well as the upsides of the growth cycle. Often states that have statewide growth management have regions that are in decline, so it becomes more politically acceptable to suggest that this policy can also deal with stimulating growth where it is needed.

Sustainable growth is the term of art of the 1990's. My impression is that advocates from growth management are placing more emphasis on environmental preservation. The model of Sustainable Development is balancing environmental, economic and social dimensions of growth. The UN conferences on Sustainable Development are built on this tripartite organizations. The Presidents Council of Sustainable Development in the US (1995) also embraces the three elements, but the social dimension (social equity) is usually downplayed.

So there are substantive differences underlying the terms, but they aren't always observed by the people using them.

Appendix B – Case Study Interviews

Katherine Graham

Katherine Graham is a Professor and Associate Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management at Carleton University. She holds degrees in Political Science from Glendon College of York University and Queen's University in Kingston.

What happened with Toronto to lead it to amalgamation?
You have to separate what was going on at the local level in Toronto with what was happening at the provincial level but obviously the two intersect. At the local level over time there were a number of forces at work shaping the dynamics between the old Metro Toronto and the area municipalities, largely cities that existed. On matters related to planning and approach to community service levels there were periodic irritants between the two levels. This was probably exacerbated by the structure of representation. There were separately elected Metro councillors as opposed to local councillors. Politicians were trying to stake out their own name and turf and the turf was shared in terms of planning issues.

There were also issues of exclusivity and ownership at the local level. In the old City of North York there were strong local preferences for rich services. It became a question of what kind of a municipality in North York as opposed to what kind do we have because of the one size fits all decision making that occurred at the upper tiered level.

The other aspect was among some local politicians there was a sense that Metro Toronto had done its job. Metro Toronto was established in the early 1950s to handle the construction of infrastructure growth and planning in the Metro Toronto area. Through the 1960s social services and policing were added as a metropolitan responsibility. The sense among local politicians was that the Metro challenge had been completed. The issues were dealt with and did not require a full government to deal with them. From a Metro Toronto perspective the question was what is the role for local councils.

At the provincial level, the PCs were elected in 1995. The whole Conservative agenda was one of reducing the number of politicians, and saving money. The Golden Task Force was a group of three people charged by the previous government to examine local government in the Greater Toronto area (includes territory from the eastern boundary of Hamilton, north to Lake Simcoe and east to Oshawa). Released a report in 1996 that recommended the elimination of Metro Toronto and the creation of a Greater Toronto Services Council. This would be a coordinating council among the municipalities and regions surrounding Toronto. It would coordinate the development and delivery of services over the Greater Toronto area.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs also announced that instead of adopting proposals to eliminate or reform Metro Toronto or the Golden recommendations, the government decided to abolish all of

the existing municipalities in Toronto and create the new City of Toronto. This came out of the blue.

There was a need to coordinate planning and redistribute finances. The central city was in danger of economic and social decline.

When they forced the amalgamation were issues of Growth management raised? If so, what were they?
The issue is there in terms of how do you manage it for the City as a whole. The issue of Growth management has increasingly been focused around the Greater Toronto Area which has a large geographic area.

The Government of Ontario released the Farrell Report before the amalgamation was announced which recommended the creation of the Greater Toronto Services Board to coordinate the planning and development of infrastructure services for the GTA on a regional level. Subsequent to that the Province appointed the former Chair of the old Metro Toronto government as a moderator. His job was to consult around the mandate of the GTSB. He worked from early 1998 to fall 1998 consulting primarily with local politicians and senior administrators and some citizens' groups from rural areas. He was concerned about political representation for the GTSB which he recommended and was adopted. The GTSB is a year and a half old.

How is it working?
It's not working in an optimal way. It has some achievements but it hasn't taken hold politically yet. Under the terms of the legislation establishing it, there was to be a review of whether or not it was achieving its mandate by 2001. That review is currently under way.

Are there any other mechanisms dealing with growth on a regional level?
There is the Greater Toronto Marketing Alliance which is looking at economic development. It is a fragile creature as well. It is voluntary.

What kind of support has come from the provincial government to help Toronto go through this metamorphosis?
They put the legislation in place and have provided for the review. There has not been a lot of policy guidance and you are seeing this on some of the planning issues. For example, there is a very hot issue about whether development would be permitted on a moraine north of the city which contains the headwaters for the water sources for the Toronto area. The GTSB is not being given status at the hearing boards on that.

The Province is not clear on policy issues.

There are various agendas at work. There are still two-tiered governments around the City of Toronto such as Peel and Yorkton

and Durham and so on. The mayors of the large municipalities are quite actively campaigning to get rid of their upper tiers. That moves on to the political level in terms of the GTSB.

One of the big issues is that the GTSB has the mandate to oversee the pooling of funds from municipalities outside the City of Toronto into Toronto to support social services and social housing. The argument being that Toronto carries a disproportionate burden of clientele for social services and is in essence a regional need. In terms of the decisions about the spending of those pooled funds reside with the City of Toronto council. There are issues around taxation without representation.

This funding formula was conceived by the provincial government as part of the legislation.

The GTSB is also responsible for Go Transit that is focused on getting people into Toronto in the morning and getting them out at night. There is a different geographic composition of the GTSB in terms of transit responsibilities.

The GTSB does not have a big staff. It was not the creation of another level of government. Its funding comes from the constituent municipalities.

What about Growth Management models in general?
The key issue is how the parameters of gowth management get established and how interests in gowth management get declared. The Province has not said how it would like to see the Toronto region grow and what it considers it to be from an environmental and economic perspective. I think it is important that provincial governments think about this.

The other thing that is important is the extent to which you can rely on voluntary collaborations when there has been a history of bad blood. In situations like that I would recommend something that is mandated. It needn't be something that is heavy but there is probably a need in that circumstance for a strong provincial presence. A strong vision and guiding principles from the beginning are paramount.

They would have to give representation to all or imposing a regime where there is possibly taxation without representation.

What about the notion that any level of administration should be as close to the grass roots as possible?
You could say that delivery should be as close as possible but other things like the planning of services should be at a higher level.

Ken Meech

Ken Meech has more than 25 years of experience as a senior administrator in municipal government. He is currently serving as the first Chief Administrative Officer for the Halifax Regional Municipality.

How did the amalgamation come about?
For years there have been a number of studies done around amalgamation. In 1994 the provincial government decided to legislate amalgamation, so it was dictated. There had been efforts through other means to share in service delivery. While everyone was always prepared to discuss it, it was hard to get them to actually commit to it.

What were some of the obstacles to shared servicing?
We had four distinct municipalities and the Metropolitan Authority (MA). It had two main responsibilities: transit and landfill and before that corrections. Each municipality had representation on the MA geared to their tax base and population. For the most part when they went to the MA they went there to represent their municipality not to look at things from a regional perspective. That was the tone and practice. There was not much loyalty to the MA.

There had also been attempts to bring about a regional policing service. They got close to the final strokes but one or two municipalities started to balk. There was also cynicism about the municipalities competing with each other to attract industry.

Finally, the government decided to legislate it here and the Cape Breton/Sydney area.

From the municipal community it was not a very positive reaction. Going through the amalgamation, one of the most difficult dynamics to deal with was the fact that all of the politicians that got elected to the new Halifax Regional Municipality had all been on the previous MA. Most of them were still reacting negatively to the notion.

We've come a long way and time helps to heal this. We are having our second election this fall. One more election and that will be put to rest in terms of reacting to the amalgamation.

Was there a level of political support from the Province?
They legislated the amalgamation. There was not a strong indication from the Province as to their stance on amalgamation. I'm not sure the public was opposed to it one way or another. About 40% thought it would be a sensible idea. Once you get by the emotional issue of community independence and identity, for the most part I don't think the public is all that concerned about the structure.

Did the Province provide funding and leadership on this issue?
There was an indication that they were going to provide funding but in reality they didn't. That was another issue that created conflict. In the end as we went through the amalgamation, the new municipality assumed it as a liability (April 1, 1996).

Did the previous municipalities have agreements with other jurisdictions that now had to be dealt with by the new municipality?
Effectively what they did is create a single tier municipality and everything was transferred to it, so it wiped out everything else.

The regional thing is a misnomer. It is a single tier urban unit. We have a large geography, so we have a lot of rural geography but the population is primarily urban. We have 2500 miles^2 and a population of 350,000. The rural areas didn't really have any other viable options. They weren't viable on their own to create a rural municipality.

Did it make sense to put them all together?
I was always proamalgamation. From my point of view it was the right decision and I think it is going to improve as time goes on. The one problem we had is that the province left the expectation with the public that there was going to be a big cost reduction overnight. The reality of that is you don't get it overnight.

We have better utilization of human resources as a result of the merger. Some people also have a higher standard in the level of service they receive now. The whole region is one economic region.

What amalgamation does is it provides more equity. We are sharing resources across the board. We are also sharing the liabilities and expenditures now too of course.

What has HRM done in terms of Growth Management?
We had a visioning exercise in cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce. This year we intend to start a regional planning exercise to look at broader issues. I think it will be more successful this time than in the past now that we have the regional municipality.

Do the HRM council members represent wards?
The councillors represent districts and the mayor is elected at large.

Is the number of councillors manageable?
I'm of the view that there should be fewer. For the next election the numbers will probably reduced to about 16.

I think there is an opportunity to create community pride in the whole region. We also emphasize that communities retain their local identity. We also have community councils that deal with more localized issues such as re-zoning. If you wanted to change the planning strategy it would have to come back to the HRM. They are not seen as another level of government because they are ultimately controlled by the regional council. There is no representation on them other than from the HRM.

Are citizens involved in this at all?
We have a fair amount of advisory councils that the public can get involved with. We also set up ad hoc committees to deal with certain issues.

Is size an issue?
We have a lot of geography. Most of it is rural and doesn't have a lot of demands on it. It isn't that hard to manage. The biggest issue is to ensure that we don't put the rural people in a position where they are subjected to a lot of unnecessary regulation.

We have three different tax rates: urban, suburban and rural. We have an urban core which has the highly urbanized and suburban area. We've determined things like whether or not sidewalks and transit is not readily available and made an adjustment to the rates to reflect that.

Is growth taking place in the urban core or the suburban fringe area?
It is a mix although we have had a fair amount of suburban growth. We'd like to get a handle on it and encourage more growth in the urban areas.

How will you develop more efficient growth patterns?
Through the regional council. We'll also involve a stakeholders group to look at some of these issues.

Topography is part of the issue in this area. This is where the majority of the employment is. There is more development happening downtown that we are trying to encourage.

Is the public more educated about the issues now?
I think generally that people think this is the right thing for the future. One thing we did run into is that after the new council was elected, is that the council members seemed to think this was an opportunity for them to push for the things they couldn't get in their areas before. There was that legacy to carry forward. Finally, we were getting hammered constantly about our operating funds. We developed a multi year financial strategy. We can now look to the future instead of constantly reacting to the past.

We have reviewed our major services and programs.

Will Pearce

How did Okotoks get to the point where they were able to implement a plan like this?
In 1997 when we were looking at our municipal development plan and were in negotiations with the Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP), we said we could go the normal route and assume growth in

Will Pearce is the Municipal Manager for the Town of Okotoks. The Municipal Manager's Office - known as the Corporate Strategy Team, provides the Town with long term policy guidance with organization-wide impact. This "broad perspective" involves a number of activities that

perpetuity and make provisions for a community of 50 – 75,000 people over 20 years. We also looked at the same time at what the carrying capacity of the Sheep River watershed was. Our initial numbers indicated we could achieve a population of 25 – 30,000. We looked at our land base in terms of a reasonable balance between residential and commercial to ensure long term viability and affordability of the community.

reflect a strategic focus. The group supports and represents Council's initiatives and directions by developing, implementing and administering strategic and legislative directions.

We then started to do projections on our tax base over time and did some initial estimates in terms of the split between residential and commercial. We looked at our alternatives should we go past our water capacity and did estimates on capital costs there. And then we looked regionally in terms of the next water supply.

We also looked at the approach of we don't have to assume growth just because everyone else does. We looked at the laws of the Province to see if we could control and cap growth. In fact this was doable if we did it wisely and with a lot of lead time. We created a framework considering the balance between commercial and residential and at our demographics. We also needed to get out of the cyclical aging of a community. We needed to create a sustainable sociological and demographic environment so a family could choose to live here, age here and retire here and their kids could choose to live here too, so we could capture the complete cycle. We are now substantially diversifying our housing stock.

We also have to create a social environment of long term sustainability. We need to move away from a bedroom community and look toward local employment and commercial services and schools and housing choices and recreational opportunities to create a balanced lifestyle built on choice.

That created a framework. This is all prior to public consultation. We needed to get the information and numbers in place first. We did a massive household survey asking about current services and all the typical things, but we also asked what they valued about the community and asked questions about lifestyle and the future of the community? We hand-delivered the surveys to the households and got about a 33% response rate. That gave us a clear guidance because 75% of the people were clear on the size of the community they wanted to live in. Not one response said they wanted to be a large community. It was a good strong mandate.

We also ran an open letter from Council in the local paper and five articles on Sustainable Okotoks to inform them of what it could be. We wanted to provide a basic understanding and awareness of what Sustainability could be.

I told council that they needed to decide who runs the community: the developers or the 11,000 citizens of Okotoks? We needed basic policy direction from them.

The Municipal Development Plan (MDP) speaks to a 25,000 population cap, it speaks to innovative neighbourhoods and community design, new streets and cross sections. We are doing things like necking down the infrastructure. We worked with the rural Municipality of Foothills. That was a fascinating meeting because they are used to dealing with the City of Calgary on things like infrastructure corridors, etc. for future urban use. We came in and said that's how big we want to be forever, we will not provide services beyond our municipal limits to prevent leap frog growth. There was literally dead silence in the room. It took them a while to grasp the concept. We now have a strong relationship with them because we went through an education process with them. What is important for them is that we are out of their business.

We just finished the majority of our annexation. We had an uncontested annexation application that just blew everybody including Municipal Affairs away.

Your model requires a good relationship with Foothills.
It requires a good understanding and a good MDP and IDP mix. What was important to Foothills was that we weren't in their business.

How do you prevent urban clustering outside your boundary?
We are encouraging subdivided lands outside our boundary so that it is impossible for future developers to acquire enough land to create a development.

What happens when you hit your population cap?
Folks will be moving in and out according to the market.

Will houses become unaffordable?
Some land values will increase. People want to live in a community of a certain size and quality.

We also do other sustainable measures like recycling and waste management. We do a lot of education with the communities around us too.

In our last annual report to the community we were able to tell the citizens what we have all achieved.

What about the buy in from the business community? Was that difficult?
Yes. We worked very hard through the Chamber of Commerce in 1998 and 1999 as we developed the MDP and IDP. We talked about business opportunities and land use bylaw changes to make it easier for them. Our tax rates are equal between residential and commercial. We have cut our business licensing fees in half with the thought of eliminating them. We've made it easier in many areas to develop

businesses through the MDP process. We're banking on the largest employment generator being in home businesses and telecommuting.

We have some businesses coming in and saying you are limiting my market. We had to put it in context for them. For instance, if we were at a 75,000 population and had WalMart here to compete with, would they be happy as a small business? The majority of small businesses supported the Sustainable Okotoks scenario.

Then you look at developers. If part of sustainability is capping growth what are the typical problems planners would face. The problem would be developers owning land beyond your boundaries and creating a base for future development. I worked personally with all the landowners in town and looked at their land bank and shaped our boundary around that.

Was there much expertise or experience in terms of the administration of the Town of Okotoks or did you have to call in experts?
We did it all ourselves. We have very good people here. A very good planner, a very good engineer, and economic development officers who are smart and innovative. We attract good people because they are excited about the opportunity here.

We are releasing a second survey in October to ensure that we are going in the right direction and still have the moral authority.

We are working with the Faculty of Environmental Design at the University of Calgary and a prominent landowner to develop a quarter section of land looking at a whole range of ideas. The Faculty is designing a sustainable neighbourhood that is introducing some new streetscapes. They developed seven housing designs that are sustainable. This is the only comprehensive market analysis in Canada. It is the only visualization process to compare the two types of designs for neighbourhoods.

We are also looking at our waste water system and reducing it through a project with Stantec.

Appendix C – Alberta Capital Region Background

In 1956 the Province appointed the McNally Commission to put forth recommendations on planning in the Edmonton and Calgary regions. Although considered insightful at the time, the McNally Commission's recommendation to enlarge Edmonton to include the surrounding metropolitan area, among others, was not followed.

Interest in regional planning in the Edmonton area had earlier taken shape with the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission (EMRPC) in the early 1950s. For a number of years the Commission was seen as farsighted primarily dealing with regional development in the metropolitan area. But by 1992 the Commission was no longer in existence.

Under the 1977 Planning Act regional planning commissions were empowered to prepare regional plans, approve subdivisions (except in Edmonton and Calgary where the Minister of Municipal Affairs designated council as the approving authority), and to provide advice to municipalities on bylaws and general planning.

The introduction of the *Municipal Government Act* in 1994 changed the role and responsibilities of municipalities. Planning shifted from a regional to an intermunicipal focus. The new Act did not provide municipalities with guidance for the direction of regional planning. Recognizing that they needed to address larger scale planning but fearing imposed limitations and controls, municipalities voluntarily formed the Alberta Capital Region Alliance, a forum that addresses regional issues.

The Alberta Capital Region Governance Review (ACRGR) was initiated in 1998. It is viewed as a way the region could gain efficiencies and effectiveness through changes in regional governance. The Review involves the Chief Elected Officers and Administrators from 22 municipalities in the region. The ACRGR is focusing on opportunities for shared service delivery among municipalities, how the Province will encourage integrated services, and determining a potential decision making framework for the process.

* * *

This is a list of common themes about regional planning that came out of interviews (see Appendix D) with local officials in the Alberta Capital Region.

Interjurisdictional relationships

- partnerships
- natural trading areas based on a common sense delivery of services that transcends geographic boundaries

- historically there has been unease between various jurisdictions; relationships based on trust need to be developed.
- ongoing debate between the merits of voluntary versus mandated relationships; ACRA is based on voluntary relationships. It has been a safe and trusting environment; the IDPs require the establishment of relationships between neighbours
- consensus building is the most realistic way to form effective voluntary relationships

Regional guidance

- need for the Province to be at the table giving guidance and direction in terms of regional planning and possibly funding

Regional planning scope

- a regional plan needs a vision and process; harmonized across boundaries yet respect authority and jurisdiction of each municipality; local autonomy or responsibility
- the whole region is healthy when all of the jurisdictions are healthy

Community identity

- each area has its own identity and sense of place that they would like to nurture and promote

Land use issues

- this planning exercise should deal with more than just land use when considering regional growth
- much antagonism and resentment grew out of the annexation battles

Service delivery

- need to seriously consider the economic considerations for service delivery and the cost of new development – is it sustainable in the future?

Appendix D – Capital Region Background Interviews

Alberta Capital Region Alliance

Interviewer's notes from phone conservation

Ken Woitt is the Executive Director of ACRA

- ACRA is not in the business of regional planning or growth management
- presently it deals with 'simplier' issues however in the recent past it has been making gestures into more sensitive areas
- 1995 – disbandment of Regional Planning Commission leaving a void of forum for regional issues
- trust, cooperation, and willingness has and is being built through more discussions about issues; anticipation that there will be enough of relationship to talk about thornier issues
- voluntary, consensus board where each municipality has a single voice at the table
- issues are either at the table and dealt with regionally or not brought to the table and not considered
- future plans and principles: five priorities outlined through the business plan for three years: communications, transportation, economic development, services, leadership in development working with the province (the last two items being looked at by ACRGR)
- ACRA is an incorporated entity with a board and voluntary funding from the municipalities
- voluntary alliance that hopes to have built a strong relationship and be able in the long term to deal with thornier issues
- provincial representation exists on task forces, none on board
- need to establish flexible fluid loose model and ACRA is able to fulfill that requirement since it makes up the rules as it goes along the process

Town of Devon

Gerald Rhodes is the Chief Administrative Officer for the Town of Devon.

Talk about the history of regionalism and growth in your area?
One of the things my councillors have told me about the former EMRPC is that it was very political. You had a block of Edmonton councillors who had a significant presence on the Board. In Devon's case every time there was a subdivision presentation they automatically, those from Edmonton, voted against it. They had a policy among them that they would approve no subdivisions whatsoever upstream of Edmonton. That soured relations between this Council and members of their Council.

With the Municipal Government Act, the positive is that we control our own destiny within our own boundaries.

My experience with other regional plans is that they are designed to offend to the point that they said nothing.

Is there a way with the MGA and local jurisdictions having their own autonomy that a marriage can be made with some sort of entity or mechanism that looks at regional planning?
The other side of it is that the rurals hate the word planning with a passion. They always thought that the cities were trying to control the rurals. Let's face it, the rurals never try to annex or grow to cities, it is always the other way around. From their perspective it is a one sided thing.

The MGA has said that we all have to have Municipal Development Plans. Time hasn't told us whether that is working yet. I am curious to see if it is working in a lot of jurisdictions.

Is there a role for another entity that has a regional planning vision to it? Should the Province take the responsibility for this role?
One of the problems with planning in the past has been that it has always been based on land use and aesthetic. What always makes the distinction is money and services. Planning in the past never dealt with the cost of water and sewer and road issues. That has always been a flaw.

What happens at the political level is growth at all costs. If they think that more people means more money, if they really did an economic analysis they may not be doing their tax payers any benefit because they should be servicing those that live there. It seems like often in the past they have been chasing people who don't live here and using the money from the people within to do it.

Subsidization means that taxpayers end up taking up the burden in the long run.

Are there regional planning activities that Devon is involved in now?
The ACRA five year transportation plan. It was good because it wasn't political. It wasn't based on politicians saying I would love to have a road, here and here.

Also, they were careful to ensure the priorities they set were regional.

Was that regional perspective easy to achieve?
They made sure that the people who approved the plan were technical and gave them a Terms of Reference from a technical basis.

It was a good regional planning initiative.

Our Mayor is involved with the Edmonton Competitive Strategy. They are trying to take a regional economic development initiative.

Can you foresee that since the transportation issue was a successful regional issue that other issues can be tackled in a similar way?
Yes. If we see success and the Province following up on it, it probably will happen.

What should the Province's role be in terms of regional planning?
When it comes to highways, that is their jurisdiction. We have always separated infrastructure from the planning process. They should be linked because they do mean a lot.

What about things like environmental considerations?
That is their jurisdiction so it does have bearing.

What about the differentiation between jurisdictions? Is it clearly defined?
It is and it isn't. Lines do get crossed. The current MGA is an enabling Act. The problem is that some people interpret that as a license to go anywhere and do anything.

Are there other issues about Growth Management that you would like to talk about?
When I've sat on various committees with mayors and reeves, they all shudder because nobody really knows what it means. All they think of is their distaste for the EMRPC. That was their only real understanding of what growth management is. Defining it is tough.

It is only in the last few years, that municipalities have started to talk about what it could mean when applied to their communities.

Does there need to be a body that has that regional perspective?
Trust is a big word. I don't know. That is a tough one. My past experience of regional plans is that they have been mush so they meant nothing.

Maybe some work needs to be done by the local municipalities to identify naturally occurring regions among them. From there start to determine what a larger scale plan should be.

One often has to stop thinking that they know the best for the people. They have to start thinking about why people live and work where they do. One of the things that has always been an issue in our community is that they wanted to get out of Edmonton. All planning may be a wash if you don't ask the customer what he is looking for and recognizing that there is more than one kind of customer with different takes out there. What defines community to them?

City of Edmonton

Interviewer's notes

Bob Caldwell, Manager, Planning and Services Branch, Planning and Development

Heather McRae, Director, Corporate Planning and Policy, Planning and Development

Brice Stephenson, Manager, Transportation Planning Branch, Transportation and Streets

What is the past history of regional planning in Edmonton?

The EMRPC was the mechanism that looked after regional planning until 1994. Edmonton City Council had representation on the Commission. Administration had input on policy through studies. The particular jurisdictions had no choice. The plan that guided the EMRPC was mandated by the provincial government. It provided consistency for how planning issues should be dealt with. The Commission provided direction for the 19 municipalities through their General Municipal Plans. This was tested legally and proved to be okay.

The planning structure implemented by the Commission set growth limits of areas, optimal sizes, and set population caps on all of the jurisdictions except Edmonton and said that there was to be a 75% Edmonton and 25% other balance of population.

This was a mechanism that was mandated to provide direction for the region in dealing with planning issues. It had some policies set in terms of how it wanted the region to grow.

In 1994, there was no longer any mechanism for regional planning. It was seen as an extra layer of bureaucracy. What resulted was there was no longer a body or a structure to deal with regional planning.

The result is that those jurisdictions interested in planning issues larger than their own boundaries built voluntary relationships. However, the layer of guidance or direction had been removed.

A number of things that came out of the MGA legislation. A requirement for intermunicipal planning meant that planners needed to cooperate between jurisdictions. It is through this cooperation that regional planning has a context. However there is a difference between regional planning and intermunicipal planning. Regional planning tends to have a broader policy context. Intermunicipal planning in practice is usually comprised of two or three partners building a relationship that is issue specific. They then use the Intermunicipal Development Plan as a comprehensive tool to formalize this relationship. Intermunicipal planning could theoretically encompass regional planning however that would mean that the parties would have to approach the table with a different outlook.

The provincial legislation outlines the kinds of practices that need to be engaged with neighbours. Edmonton sat down with six of its neighbours one-on-one to make agreements on issues.

A successful example of regional planning is transportation. It is the closest to a regional mechanism and perspective that we have. The

22 municipalities have sat down to determine the priorities for the region. The Transportation Authority asked questions such as what is a regional transportation facility versus a local transportation facility. They established criteria to ascertain what is what. What came out of this was that the transportation authority is working with provincial facilities. Some of their priorities are that they are using transportation to link regional economic zones. Plan Edmonton establishes the hierarchy of roads and transit systems.

They also established who has responsibility. In 1998 there was a Premier's Task Force on infrastructure. They realized that while addressing regional transportation issues the Province needed to bring more funding to the table. One of the major priorities that came out of this process was the improvements to Anthony Henday Drive. They set up a five year plan to deal with transportation infrastructure. Alberta Infrastructure is now using this plan for the Capital Region. The Transportation Authority is then a good regional voice to approach the Province for funding because they have credibility behind them.

What about other areas besides transportation that have a regional perspective?
There is limited cooperative regional planning. There are service agreements that are made through partnerships. In the area of land use there is the Airport Authority. It is a planning mechanism that brings together the airport's direct neighbours and Edmonton. This group is able to look at the impact of the airport in that geographic vicinity.

Edmonton went through an extensive Inter Municipal Plan with Strathcona County. We have a good working relationship at the IMP level; we work well together group to group. Where the fractiousness exists is at the political level. Edmonton had representation on the Sturgeon Steering Committee for their MDP. On the Municipal Government Board we work well at the technical level.

In Plan Edmonton there is a section on the protocol for how to behave with our neighbours. Edmonton expects that these neighbours have the same reciprocal agreements.

There is a list of regionally significant issues. These are the river valley, the airport, and the military base. The latter of which we hope to annex.

There is also a section in the MDP outlining the strong role that Edmonton needs to play in the region promoting leadership and cooperation. This leadership role is exercised through the service relationships with our neighbours and with other levels of government. Edmonton believes it is important for it to have a strong role in the region.

Within the directive of the MGA the city is functioning very well reaching out to its neighbours and entering into partnerships such as that for the airport. An example of a voluntary alliance is the River Valley Alliance where all municipalities are working collectively. Another example is the development of the Highway 2 guidelines that brought together more than just the immediate neighbours. Edmonton is guided by specific outcomes and improvements in the planning of its urban municipality.

The role of Edmonton on ACRA.
Edmonton is a strong administrative player in the alliance which is a vehicle to talk to the rest of the region. We provide 85% of its fees. It is a successful information sharing vehicle.

Relationship with provincial government.
In terms of transportation the Province is taking a strong role in planning of regional transportation. They have established a forecasting model and are requiring municipalities to share information to make it as accurate as possible.

The MGA removes the provincial government from the planning scene. They no longer provide leadership or guidance on regional planning issues. They have handed over that responsibility to the municipalities. The EMRPC library and the MGA library are now being housed at the Edmonton Planning Department.

What about the future?
The jurisdictions need to be the ones responsible for preparing their plans with their outcomes in mind. Otherwise it can't be a planning exercise of any value. The mechanism for looking at regional planning needs to either be through a new form of cooperation or mandated. It all revolves around the issue of governance. How to develop that regional view? Do the citizens want regional planning? Edmonton believes that it needs to participate and that it needs to provide leadership in this regional approach. Hard work has gone into the IDPs producing joint benefits for our partners.

Waste management is one area that can be dealt with through regional planning. Economic development as well. It is all based on issues of scale. The debate is either the philosophical versus the political.

The trend is to work toward the city state. Super regions are developing as healthy entities compared to the old notions of provinces or states. The notion that Edmonton is the capital of the province, a star on a map, is not realistic.

We need to take a regional vision. Everything except city governance is working on a regional model; schools, health care provisions, infrastructure. The logic of how they set up their system may not be

understood. It makes sense internally but it is not based on geography. These systems are relationships of cooperation. They are contractual agreements based on economy and efficiency. For example, the transportation department is the dispatcher for regional transportation. What we hope is that we as a region can find the cleanest way to function with the Province maintaining a strong role.

The Province is taking jurisdiction away from the city. For example, Edmonton used to have control of its highways. Now the Province is taking responsibility for the north south corridor.

Is the transportation model transferrable to other areas?
In the issue of land use this would not be possible. It is too contentious. The economics are just too heavy. Developers are working throughout the whole region and they would probably like to have the same rules, the same standards. The counter argument is that they can have more choices if they know all the rules thereby increasing internal competition.

Edmonton has a section in the MDP explaining its philosophy on "cooperate to compete". We will work collectively with other jurisdictions to attract revenue to the Capital Region but compete to ensure that it arrives in Edmonton. This might be altered if there were a revenue sharing mechanism. Edmonton feels it is important to fight to gain the largest portion possible of this small tax base to ensure it can provide the best possible services to its citizens.

There is no uniformity of service standards throughout the region. There is a lot of duplication between municipalities. For example cultural facilities are being built throughout the region competing with Edmonton's facilities and yet some large jurisdictions do not have their own hospitals. This is illogical.

When you fly over the region in a plane and see the patterns of settlement and map the areas of public facilities and infrastructure, the planning is illogical.

We as administrators make it work and make it work well with what we can even though the whole region is working in an illogical direction. We see that it is not necessarily the best for the whole region for the future yet we must make the best with what we have.

City of Fort Saskatchewan

Ken Hodgins is the Mayor of the City of Fort Saskatchewan.

Paul Benedetto is the City Manager for the City of Fort Saskatchewan.

What is Fort Saskatchewan's idea of growth management and what is some of the City's past involvement in regional planning? Where would you like to go? Where would you not like to go?
Ken – The Cities of Fort Saskatchewan and Leduc have put together a growth management perspective paper for the regional governance review. That is some of the principles and some of the guidelines that

should be used in the regions when they are looking at growth from the planning and economic perspective.

How did Fort Saskatchewan and Leduc partner to produce this document?
Ken – We are similar size municipalities on the periphery of a large municipality. We deal with a lot of the same issues, a lot of the same service delivery and a lot of the same planning issues. We talked to them and said we are dealing with a lot of the same issues maybe we should sit down and talk and maybe we should get an outside opinion on this. It might be advantageous for the governance review if we did that. So instead of just coming from the two of us we hired some outside experts to help us put this perspective together. It was generally accepted that those were good principles. Especially the City of Edmonton thought when we put them forward they should have been put forward a lot sooner and discussed. The other municipalities agreed with them. They didn't agree with them a hundred percent but they agreed that these principles were good basic planning principles that could be used by municipalities. Some of these principles are a little more urban focused than rural focused but they still are good planning principles and they do address issues for both urban and rural areas.

One of the things with this whole governance review is urban-rural issues have not been addressed enough.

As separate entities or how they can work together?
Ken - Let's face it they are separate identities. There's a lot of issues that are urban rural issues that haven't been addressed. They may be addressed further down in the Review when you get to how services are to be delivered because the whole Review is to determine how we can provide services in a more cost effective and efficient manner. When you start getting into how services are delivered you start getting into the urban and rural issues. Policing for example, the rurals don't use their tax base to pay for policing. It's paid for by the Province. When we start talking about any of the services, 90% of the population live in an urban municipality. When you are talking service delivery you are talking about delivery from an urban municipality to an urban municipality. The rurals deliver very few services to the citizens compared to urbans.

Do you believe that there needs to be a body to guide the planning mechanism for the integration of service delivery?
Ken - Eventually, yes because somebody has to make the decisions. There has to be a regional body to make those decisions. From a planning perspective when the Province got out of planning (the EMRPC) that was a disaster for Edmonton, the whole province. There was no body that took a long term perspective for that area for growth. It became a free for all. Very loose. So there is no body right now that looks at the whole region.

You don't think that ACRA does that?
No. ACRA is a very good discussion group and they are working on some initiatives but they have not dealt with the real issues of how you are going to fund, who is going to make the decisions, etc. They've never really dealt with decision making and voting.

Paul – ACRA has not had a lot of focus with respect to planning issues with exception they've done some very good work looking at the transportation system and upgrading some maps, demonstrating some of the transportation priorities but that, although it is very valuable information, is quite a narrow focus in some of the issues that have to be addressed on a regional basis.

The City of Fort Saskatchewan and the City of Leduc in putting forward these planning principles were looking at it from a regional perspective. Certainly there is reference made to the global economy and competitiveness in terms of economic development. We think it would be beneficial for companies or other interested parties looking at the region if they could get maps depicting land use and development patterns for the entire region. It would be very important to show things like utility corridors, transportation links, etc. so it has been done in a very integrated manner. Now we say that and the paper recognized the importance of local planning autonomy.

It would be interesting to look at the experience of the region. A lot of concern exists around the role of the former EMRPC and I don't think anyone is looking at recreating the EMRPC but I think there is a great need for an effective vehicle that would address some of those issues. That's on the macro level. In terms of the micro level there are planning issues that need to be addressed between municipalities and between jurisdictions. The various efforts in the region in terms of addressing those issues, and I think there has been a real variance in terms of degrees of success.

I think there is really a desire that we can find a better way, a more proactive way to deal with some of this. No one wants to be involved in annexation battles. Municipalities are talking to their neighbours to try and avoid that. We need to come up with a better program to properly address those planning issues and not end up with incompatible developments that create long term problems that will be issues that others will have to resolve down the road.

How do you envision that process might take form?
Paul - In the Portland area they have created maps for the region that would outline where land uses are appropriate and address other planning issues. I think really the key is looking at some of those experiences from the broad planning perspective but as well addressing the aspects of some of these intermunicipal planning issues. Ultimately you have to deal with such issues as boundary adjustments, giving the municipality the power to develop area

structure plans and plan for the future of utility and road extensions into areas so they are logically developed. That is a big part of the work. Hopefully there are some positive models that we can find and apply to this region. To do that you have to understand what's happened in the region in the past.

Ken - Boundary adjustments are something that is going to have to be looked at. I don't think we want to end up with situations like Winnipeg or in the Vancouver where they have another level of government with the GVRD. That's still dealing with a limited number of issues in Vancouver. It doesn't deal with all of the municipal issues.

When you look at our job as municipal governments it is to deliver services to the citizens in the most cost effective and efficient way. There are so many times in delivering these services that the boundaries impede the natural or common sense delivery of services. Planning services for a developer that wants to plan roadways, he runs into an artificial boundary that is legislated. There isn't the natural common sense method of designing and planning of a municipality. Lots of examples of where the delivery of services across boundaries do not happen because there is a boundary there. I am in favour of delivering services without boundaries if someone can show me how we can do it without a ton of intermunicipal agreements being negotiated and there is a dispute mechanism built into every one and we're not developing lawsuits between municipalities, if we can do that and it is more cost effective to have these intermunicipal agreements, then somebody's got to prove it to me and I would like to see how it is going to work.

Are you saying that in conjunction with not having another layer of government another body that will look after those concerns?
Ken – I am saying that if we have 22 municipalities in this region who can look after regional issues through intermunicipal agreements I don't know how that is going to work. How are we going to deliver all of these services – I don't know how that is going to happen. If some can prove to me that is the most cost effective way of doing things, I would love to see their plan. The other side of it is, in order to focus this region and for growth in the future to handle all of the issues that are going to come up, I think there is going to have to be some sort of decision-making body. If we are going to go with a commission for each of the 30 services with 22 people sitting on each one, they are going to be making decisions? I don't know…

Those seem like issue based entities rather than looking collectively at what could happen in a region.
Ken - whatever this group is there has got to be some method or mechanism to look at the region and plan for the region. This mechanism has to have some authority.

There are two issues that seem to come into play: in Portland it was state imposed. They said for each region: this is what we would like to see and the municipalities had to figure what they had to do to comply with the state Growth Management plan. Then each municipality has to then comply with the regional plan. In conjunction with that they needed some larger overseeing power.
Paul – in looking at those models there certainly seems to be a lot of sensitivity around the way the old EMRPC functioned. I think we're looking for an opportunity. There are certainly a lot of intermunicipal agreements in place to share services. To have that opportunity expanded would be beneficial. We are trying to find a positive way to deal with the regional planning issues that would be complimentary. You look at the concern with it being top down imposed or whether you are being effective in dealing with all of the local issues and I think what you need is a framework where those local issues can be addressed. In the absence of being able to reach an agreement there is an effective positive way to mediate or find a solution where there are impasses.

It is important that we have compatible land uses, that we are coordinating appropriate transitions between land uses and that they are planned properly. I really think that is the key issue. Finding positive ways to achieve that. I think that some people would react to the Portland model as being very similar to the EMRPC.

Ken – I think that the Growth Management perspectives that we put forward are more than just the planning and land use issues. Those principles can be applied to service delivery. We need a regional perspective for how these are delivered.

We don't want to get into leapfrog development.

We will have to develop guiding principles for service delivery.

Does there need to be a formalized process put in place to come with these guiding principles or is it okay for them to appear by default?
Ken – they have been put forward in the process. I think they have to be strengthened in their importance in the review. They have to be given a higher priority within the review.

Should there be a mechanism for larger input to come up with a regional set of principles?
Ken – these are regional perspectives. It is for all the municipalities in the region to understand them. Some areas may have to be expanded and strengthened.

Paul – this is a very good framework from a regional perspective. It is important for their to be discussion and dialogue to create a better

buy in. To be successful looking at future growth, this is a very important part of the review and there should be a good dialogue around it.

What was the process that was used to come up with these principles?
Paul - We looked at a regional perspective and what sort of guidelines would have to be put in place to guide development in the region.

Ken – In Halifax, they took Halifax and Bedford which were urban oriented and combined them with Dartmouth and a big rural area which were of like minds. They put them together to solve a debt problem and have created more problems. If they would have created two municipalities, over half of their problems would have been eliminated from day one. They tried to mix urban and rural to solve a debt problem and it didn't work.

Eventually the Province is going to have to make a decision. They've got lots of information. They need to do an analysis of it. They are going to have to fund some more studies. They are going to have to really get into how services are delivered in a cost effective, efficient manner.

I think it is extremely difficult to get 23 municipalities together to decide on regional issues. I think we need fewer municipalities and that they should be formed on a sub regional basis based on natural trading areas and they should be around municipal service units.

I think we should reduce the number of municipalities down to seven or eight through amalgamation.

If this region is going to be competitive with others across North America we've got to get together.

Paul – there are a couple of examples in the region that are indicators of success with municipalities working together. The Nisku Leduc Economic Development Authority, the Heartland Industrial Association. That sort of approach needs to be expanded across the region. Another initiative that our city and nine other municipalities have been involved with is the intermunicipal cooperation initiative. It didn't focus any effort on the governance model but nine municipalities got together to talk about sharing of services.

It's hard to legislate cooperation. In this region there were nine regions that actually got together.

Ken – If we are afraid to deal with the difficult issues, we'll just keep putting them off. This doesn't help the region and it doesn't help the taxpayers. The soft issues are easy to deal with.

County of Leduc

Phil Newman is the Director of Planning and Development for Leduc County.

Larry Majeski is the County Manager of Leduc County and has served the municipality for over 30 years.

Ottilie Murray is the Senior Planner with Leduc County.

NB: 'unclear' refers to where the poor phone connection made hearing the interview difficult

I'm wondering if we could start with the history of Leduc's perception and experience with regional planning.
Larry - Do you want to go back into the time of the former planning commission? Sure. And what were things that Leduc did that might have worked in terms of regional planning and what were some things that it would have liked to have done and what were its experiences with some of the mechanisms that were involved that dealt with regional planning. Basically, we were for quite a long time a member of the EMRPC. That body performed services for us for several years here in terms of doing the subdivision handling, the subdivision application process, helping or working with our council in and staff here in terms of developing or preparing our statutory planning documents.

And how was that process for Leduc?
Larry - It was perhaps not that fondly remembered were the cases of dealing with subdivision applications in our county and (unclear) body consisting of municipal representatives from around the region that decided on applications that were occurring within our boundaries probably not understanding or being familiar with the specific locations people in the communities all sorts of things.

So in other words, the voice and the character of Leduc were not being respected in these particular decisions?
Larry - In some respects. There were times when there was understanding. You really have to understand that our voice was one of 27 at the table.

Right.
Larry - Why you'd have a body like that dealing with minor subdivision matters I don't think in some respects made a lot of sense.

Were these subdivision matters that were interjurisdictional or was it just within a particular small location?
Larry - Basically within a small location. They were like the first parcel outs acreage out of a quarter section or quarter section splits. There were occasions. We didn't have an awful lot, but there were high density subdivisions as well. The other area I guess we did develop through the course of time a fairly large significant industrial park adjacent to the international airport here.

Tell me about the history of that.
Larry - There I don't think I could tell you an awful lot about other than it started off as a development of about eighty acres with the intent of being directed at companies that required larger land areas. Not as intensive a development. Basically they required more outdoor storage but it has basically evolved (unclear) it is quite intensive I guess (unclear) largely still servicing the energy (unclear).

So when it was planned, was it foreseen what kind of long term development it might become? Or was it just recognized to service a particular small portion of the industry?
Larry - Basically, I think it was basically promoted as an energy center for like western Canada. This is the promotion of it by and large.

And this was largely 40 years ago, wasn't it? It was quite a long time ago.
Larry - Oh, it was first started in the early 70s about 30.

And is there any other planning done now to guide where the future of that particular park might go? Or other kinds of industry that might be attracted to that particular type of park?
Phil - The County's MDP of October 1999 provides for growth in an area adjoining the City of Edmonton boundary on the east side of Highway 2. It eliminated a small area east of the City of Leduc (unclear) industrial area. But another factor which is of importance is the airport and the airport authority has its plans for limited (unclear) in commercial and industrial development adjoining Highway 2 between the terminal and Highway 2, south of Highway 19.

Are there partnerships being established now with the City of Edmonton and the airport authority to be able to look at the planning of this particular project or was it an initiative that Leduc came up with and is basically informing its neighbours? How did this whole process work out?
Phil - The growth area (unclear) was discussed with the City of Edmonton. It was agreed upon with the City of Edmonton (unclear) the County is a partner with other municipalities in the area. (unclear) authority. As far as the MDP history (unclear) industrial growth.

Larry - Well, the section along the Highway 2 immediately south of Edmonton or adjacent to Edmonton boundary has been identified as a industrial node for several years. That goes back to the days of the planning commission. Like as was Nisku industrial park an industrial node. So basically (unclear) with Edmonton and (unclear) industrial area. Contemplation of any change in it was I guess (unclear) to what Edmonton was proposing north within their boundary.

Are you still there?
Larry - In the Ellerslie area within Edmonton they also have a similar sort of industrial zoning. Industrial commercial zoning so part of our discussions with Edmonton also included an industrial reserve area which basically was (unclear) their area (unclear) our boundary. So on the boundary between the two municipalities there was basically (unclear) similar sort of proposed long-term uses.

Interviewer asks for clarification over distinction between City of Leduc and Leduc County.
Larry - Leduc County and the City of Leduc are two separate entities: one being a city and the other being the County with the same name.

What is your partnership with the city?
Larry - We have a fairly large geographic area about 65 miles east-west. Twenty miles in a north southerly direction. We have several urban municipalities within our boundaries, our outer boundaries kinda thing and the largest of that are the City of Leduc, Beaumont, Devon, Calmar, Thorsby, Warburg, and New Sarepta. We have seven municipalities as well as three summer villages around Pigeon Lake.

At the table each one has representation and you also have representation?
Larry - Correct. We have our chief elected official is called a Reeve for the county and the urban centers' chief elected official is called a mayor.

What kind of collaboration exists between the county and those particular municipalities in terms of regional planning within the county boundaries?
Larry - With the advent of the new MGA, the new focus,new direction the Province was encouraging and directing municipalities to work in that was when they withdrew the regional planning commissions that is essentially what they wished to see municipalities do to meet together and develop intermunicipal planning arrangements I guess. When you have common boundaries with municipalities you develop an intermunicipal plan with that urban center like a regarded as a rural or a county like we are we at one time developed two agreements. We developed two annexation agreements, one with the City of Leduc and one with the Town of Beaumont. We will probably do more of that with other communities in the future as well. Basically, the intermunicipal plans are built with a referral between the municipalities either side of that common boundary. Development interests or proposals that have not been previously subject to a planning document, those documents would be referred for comment only, not vetoed, just for comment of the other municipality.

So each jurisdiction is independent and there is a relationship of trust between them that will develop into a working relationship?
Larry - Yes, that's one way of saying it. Yeah.

What about on really sticky issues that one party doesn't want to address and the other one feels is appropriate? Is there a mechanism to bring those kind of issues to the table?
Larry - Basically in our documents we have a liaison committee (unclear) members from each council come together to discuss issues

that may arise. There have been none, but if there are issues in the future. I guess the ones that are more sensitive. And it works both ways for both municipalities. It could relate to sight, sound, noise (unclear) so to speak you know and impact that potentially reverse those boundaries.

Do these relationships take place with other adjacent counties?
Larry - We have been working with one, the one that basically has a long common boundary with us is Wetaskiwin to the south and we have had discussions with that county in two areas specifically around lakes that are on our boundaries. There are two lakes there and we've looked at the concept of a lake management plan. That is I guess still in the works. That hasn't been finalized. Wizard Lake is one of the lakes.

What kind of regional planning system, and that would include growth, what kind of entity would you like there to be?
Phil - By entity do you mean body?

Not just body, but a plan or a vision.
Phil - It is a big question. It would need to be a process by which policies are planned and some services provided in a way that was harmonized across municipal boundaries but would have to respect the authority and jurisdiction of each of those municipalities.

In what way?
Phil - I think this approach is one that works on consensus building. That's usually easier when it is around simple issues.

What about on the more difficult issues such as revenue sharing?
Larry - May I ask you where or who has the perception revenue sharing is a sticky issue?

I've heard that from a number of people.
Larry - We have within our boundaries basically cost sharing several cost sharing agreements for various purposes where they make sense. They include recreation, culture, library services, protection services. Like we work together most of the municipalities work together on ambulance services (unclear) fire (unclear) and other emergency services.

So those agreements have arisen out of consensus building processes?
Phil - (unclear) and the Economic Development Authority.

Larry - That is a success story in itself. The City of Leduc and the County of Leduc created the Leduc-Nisku Economic Development Authority back in about 1984. And it is working quite well.

So consensus building is a realistic step in this process.
Phil - I think so. If you look at the history of ACRA for instance it is not necessarily an easy process but they have (unclear) allocation of money from the Province on road improvements or road construction but if you swing right to the other end of the spectrum and envisage an authoritarian approach and it may be superficially attractive because consensus building is difficult, the old regional planning system had the ability to be authoritarian. If you look at the working of the old planning commission it didn't work for a variety of reasons. Yes, consensus building is difficult but to recognize the municipal political system and its organizational structure that the County feels has a lot of potential and is the direction it should be heading.

Is there a role in the consensus building process for the public?
Phil - They are an integral part of the planning process.

How are they being included by the municipalities in terms of the planning process and how should they beincluded?
Phil - Well, each municipality is involving the public in its own way. A great array of processes can be followed. Council is very conscious that they are elected to perform certain services. I'm not sure I'm answering your question. Perhaps you could elaborate?

In a number of different examples there is quite a wide range of how the public is involved in the process from public hearings to the public being invited into the process to make those decisions for themselves.
Phil - I think in any municipality like Leduc County you've got a fair involvement of the general public that are on different boards, committees, related to different aspects of county life. The County Council recognizes the authority it is given and the responsibility it is given to use that authority carefully and as the general public as an interested party.

Larry - We have a couple of areas as examples where on committees we have that community input. They are invited to participate ranging from community support services on an ongoing basis, parks and recreation.

Are there approaches to regional planning that the county does that we should know about?
Phil - I think the consensus building approach has the respect for the (unclear) by partners in the region. That underlies the approach (unclear) that occurred in 1995 ought to be welcomed.

Where should leadership come from to provide regional guidance for that consensus based process?
Larry - You are talking in a very general sense but I suppose you could break that down in terms of selective items where you could

provide leadership I guess similar to what the current ACRA is doing such as with economic development, transportation master planning, things that are looking at the regional interests. I think there are examples where the municipalities have gotten together already to look at services on a regional basis. In terms of commission (unclear) looking at bulk water, manufacture in the area.

So the fact that these bodies are made up of people with local interests you don't believe impedes a regional vision?
Phil - Think regionally. Act locally. I don't fully feel there is an unresolvable conflict there. Any individual (unclear) think locally and will also be able to think regionally. They are not as parochial as I think some commentators and participants in the field would necessarily believe. That said, one aspect that we haven't discussed is of course the Province. I am assuming you are working around to that. They obviously have an important role. They must buy into the system approach that is adopted. People like Alberta Infrastructure or other departments (unclear) similar approach and we have great difficulty.

At this point does it feel like the Province is on side and is understanding what the municipalities want to do?
Larry - By the committee that has been drawn together in this governance review process I think there has been a number of these issues that have been brought to that attention. I understand just on the reporting back that we are a region here and yet back with the various government departments different ones of us are in different districts of the province, provincial jurisdictions, i.e. infrastructure, environment, so fourth.

Is that okay to have different departments to deal with or should there be a mechanism that you can deal with that would look at the overlapping interests you may have?
Phil - I would hope that they have that integration (unclear).

If there are a number of municipalities and their administrative areas and a number of government departments and their administrative areas sitting around the same table is that too complex a process or should there be another mechanism set up to do more decision making and information sharing?
Phil - It may well be appropriate to put together groups that can handle that. In fact we would be open to different approaches. (unclear) to assist the concensus based approach at the municipal level. I would hope.

Do you have any idea what that body might look like?
Phil - Not at this stage. I think we are dealing with the principle rather than the detail.

Are there other philosophical or other principle ideas behind regional planning that you feel the county has that I should know about?

Larry - Just a comment on the consensus building. I think there is generally felt to be stronger (unclear) outcomes versus something that is dictated.

Phil - Some of the discussions have focussed on land use and development. I want to draw attention to some of the comments we were making around soft services. Growth Management is not just for hard services. We are talking on a provincial level. We are talking about Growth Management. You need to be looking at the provincial level. You need to be looking at the soft services such as education because they are an integral part of growth and enhanced Growth Management. That's why provincial integration in this process is important. A lot of attention is focussed on regional municipalities. I think the Province should look at itself in the mirror and ask whether it is integrated or as regionally focussed or supportive as they are looking for the municipalities to be. At the municipal level a lot of the agreement and intermunicipal work that is going on here on a sub regional level is happening in a lot of areas that are an important part of Growth Management such as emergency services and lake management, libraries, recreation, FCSS. There is an awful lot happening already. The County is looking to build on those successes and those experiences and believes that it is best on a consensus building basis and that the community is involved throughout the initiatives that the county has been part of.

Larry - We also deliver services to our neighbours, planning, assessment services, (unclear) in that business at one time and withdrawn (unclear) inspection.

Phil - And we're working with the airport authority and two cities on the airport facility protection area, noise abatement, a whole host of activities to improve life in the County. It is a complex mix. Flexibility can often be an asset rather than a rigid authoritarian process.

Municipal Affairs – Alberta Provincial Government

How did the Municipal Government Act come about?

The MGA came about with the local governments asking to act more independently. So the MGA was looked at with the theme of autonomy for local governments. That usually carries responsibilities as well, although who should be doing what is still a matter of discussion. As a matter of fact there is at least the beginning of thoughts from the local governments and the provincial government that they need to sit down and work out the roles and responsibilities between them. I anticipate something like that happening on a more formal basis in the next year or so.

Harold Williams is a Coordinator with the Regional Partnerships Planning and Coordination Unit of Alberta Municipal Affairs.

The restructuring of how provincial money moves to the local level is also a very important part of the MGA and the change that took place. There were significant dollars in terms of grants going to municipalities that were unconditional. That worked for a number of years because that supported the notion of government closest to the people. That changed in 1993 when the government took on some reforms about how money was spent and how to control the deficit and that touched on every sector. For local governments that was a significant change. A lot of change came quickly for a lot of people.

The other driving force that put the Act in place was the myriad of separate statutes that pertained to local government operations. These have all now been repealed and they are a part of the MGA. The planning area of the Act is most aligned toward issues of Growth Management.

Regional planning commissions were removed. More autonomy on this issue went back to the municipalities although there was encouragement to develop municipal development plans and sharing that information.

What if there is a dispute?
There is a requirement for them to inform each other of their plans. When there is a conflict they have the ability to take the dispute before the Municipal Government Board (MGB) within Municipal Affairs. There is now a requirement within the last two years to look at alternate dispute mechanisms before coming to the MGB. The forums that are there now are to encourage them to work it out locally.

In terms of regionalism is there a different approach to how municipalities deal with their situations?
It depends on the local councils and the local thinking. The current Minister is encouraging regional partnerships. He makes it clear it is not about forced amalgamations or legislation. It is about good information and support for those municipalities who want to come to the table and think regionally and take those opportunities.

Any structures that arise from that will likely be customized to the particular needs of the areas. That could be anything from a handshake agreement about things that affect others outside of their own municipal borders.

Will the Province be at the table?
The Province is there as a support and as providing information.

Will the Province try to ensure that there is consistency between one regional table and another?
Yes, the thinking is developing as we go and as the needs of municipalities emerge. What may be thought about right now is the

provincial government providing some resources such as facilitation expertise, information gathering and provision to local areas that want to proceed.

Not funding?
That is a consideration but it is not a definite at this point.

Is this the philosophy that is being applied to the ACRGR?
I think there are similarities. I think the difference is that because of the history of the actions taken in this region, there was a heightened awareness by the previous Minister about not getting back into that kind of situation again. The provincial government sees its role as not formally initiating a review like this but being there to support, inform, and help develop what comes out of the local partners.

So it won't have a guidance role?
Only if asked.

What happens in the future? The local jurisdictions just get together and decide what happens and the Province just sits back and watches?
The Province has an idea that it is very difficult for individual municipalities to go it alone in terms of attracting growth, retaining growth and prosperity in their area. With globalization the trend is that there is some activity that is going on regionally. you can talk about all sorts of things from delivering services efficiently to economies of scale right to joint efforts to attract business into an area without getting into competitive fights between local municipalities.

So wouldn't a logical extension from that be amalgamation?
That is something that the Province has said no to at this point.

In terms of issues around Growth Management, does the Province have guidelines or standards set out that it would like municipalities to work toward?
There are environmental standards in place. There are infrastructure standards that must be met.

Those are usually quite independent of Growth Management. So that link hasn't been made yet.
I don't think it is a direct link in the way that you are describing it. If you stay within the standards, then you have flexibility within your area to suit the needs of your citizens.

What about the concept of some people saying that now each body has one voice at a particular table and other people saying it is not that cut and dried?
I'm not sure that the Act has anything to say about that. That may come from the fact that the Act has something called natural person

powers. In other words a municipality, except where restricted by the Act, has natural person powers. So if it was moved to a court action they could act like a natural person. It is a legal concept.

Are we going to deal with our issues specifically through representation by population or is that not going to get all of our issues dealt with? Is that the only way we can deal with things or are there more sophisticated ways for us to come to the table and have our issues resolved in a way that is not veto by population. To their credit, these local governments are elected locally and they are being asked to think outside that box.

Are there other aspects of the Act that cover Growth Management?
Part One is good to look at because it gives the idea of what local government is all about. Another area to look at is under Part Two by-laws and the general jurisdiction of by-laws. Part Seven looks at public participation, Part 14 talks about general ministerial powers, Part 15.1 talks about regional services commissions, Part 17 talks about planning and development.

River Valley Alliance

Dr. Ray Rasmussen is the Co-Chair of the River Valley Alliance and has been with the group for four years.

How did the voluntary River Valley Alliance come about?
The Alliance is three years old. It started with an idea from a citizen of Edmonton. Their idea was that the river valley was an important entity in the region that should last for 50 years or more. They also thought that it would take forward planning and support from citizens to keep it what it is now and to ensure that it reaches its full potential.

Part of that idea was that there should be access to the river and a trail system, a variety of recreational options, and that it shouldn't be overdeveloped.

That citizen went to the City and the Mayor and explained the idea. They got support from the City and then went out to other municipalities and brought people in.

The first meetings were meetings of a group of citizens from the municipalities that were willing to participate and politicians from the municipalities that were willing to participate. Originally there were only four municipalities. Now it has gone to all seven of the municipalities that boarder on the river.

The group first created a vision and got some seed money from the municipalities and the private sector. They made a video tape which they took with them on visits to the municipalities and asked them to endorse the alliance and produce citizen and politician members of the alliance. A month ago the last municipality came on board.

We have sought representation from the federal and provincial government. We now have them at the table, too. Some of our people had political connections, some were just members of the general public.

One of the things we did to develop full representation was to go out and identify the stakeholder groups and to develop a vision. The present Alliance has good representation from these groups.

We slowly developed a vision plan and then a business plan. Meanwhile we have also been putting a communications plan in operation to let people know about what we are doing.

Now we are in a consolidation period. We are starting to seek major funding from various sources including the provincial and federal government and private donors.

We are an advisory committee to the seven municipal councils that endorse us. We have a particular vision that we are speaking for.

We have already faced some tough issues. We decided not to go into specific issues too early. We have refused to participate in any special interests. We're not in the business of endorsing anything specific at this point. Our role is promoting the vision and seeking funds to promote the park plan of the vision. We're seeking $60 million and that has to do with developing a trail system from one end to the other.

There is some controversy within that. Some people don't want their land crossed for fear of what might happen. That will emerge as a big issue. We don't have a position on that right now. We are looking at positive incentives to pull them in. Since we have all of the representation we at least have the chance to have some discussion.

At some point some of us on the committee think that there needs to be a river valley commission. That is not us. That commission would look at all of the proposals for the river valley and say endorse or don't endorse a development. I imagine we will end up recommending a commission of some sort. We have not taken any authority from the municipalities at this point. If the commission became an authority within an authority where you had to go through one to get to the other to get approval, that might end up becoming a little more controversial.

City of Spruce Grove

Simon Farbrother, City Manager for Spruce Grove, AB, has been involved with the Alberta Capital Region Governance review from its start. He has been a member of the Canadian Institute of Planners since 1990. Mr. Farbrother has worked in various capacities in municipal planning for the past 10 years.

General observations about Growth Management

It is critical for individual communities or groups of communities to have an understanding of the issues and ramifications surrounding Growth Management for the successful development of those

principals in the region. If you don't know what you are trying to be you won't get there.

The interrelationships between communities becomes more and more critical especially as we move toward city states and areas of regional compatibility. It is about achieving a level of success that communities on their own cannot achieve, it is about managing growth, not just responding to it or limiting it. It is about bringing higher order issues to the table, and having the resources and commitment to deal with them. There are no cookie cutter solutions for this region but there may be regional similarities and joint objectives.

History of Growth Management

The Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission's definition of growth incorporated land use and conservation issues. Issues around air quality were talked about but there was no legislation or formal framework.

When the legislation changed in 1994, there was very much a move toward deregulation. There wasn't a strong decision about whether that was a good or bad decision. What came out of that was if you are not going to have any formalized system then you need to have some dialogue between municipalities. You can't just plan independently.

Very much the focus of the legislation is if two parties agree, do it. If two parties don't, you won't likely move very far on the issue.

When you look at the Edmonton region there is nothing that looks like a Growth Management plan or any decision making around this region.

There have been two renditions of a municipal alliance - the capital region alliance – one vote, one party, collaborative, voluntary. Its strengths were that it was voluntary - parties agreed to do something. Its weakness was lack of funding and lack of legislative ability to do something, ability to deal with tough issues.

Current situation

The current situation is whether at the macro regional level there is an ability to determine what you want to be at the regional level. At the municipal level we have been able to do this. The ideal is that you will be able to put these jigsaw puzzles together and come up with a complete picture.

At a higher level there is mediation, annexation, legislation focused on you guys got to work it out. Where development takes place, who develops, what kind of development will take place that is decided at a municipal level. The province does have guidelines that are general and have no authority.

We are at the stage where we are seeing significant development taking place but with no regional context to it. Industrial heartland of communities got together to say where industry would take place.

Part of the reason for the province getting involved in the governance review is economic development – the view that city states and regional entities need to compete. Edmonton is seen as 20 independent communities.

What mechanism do we need to put that together at a political and administrative level?
There is significant fear from rural communities that didn't like the old commission that something like that could come back.

With the Municipal Government Act the rural communities are now equals.

The general feeling is about what is happening in our community. Unless a regional issue is impacting you directly, regionalism will be less of an issue.

Right now there has to be win wins for everyone. Leadership at a regional level is in a vacuum. Agreements are voluntary so on predominately safe topics. In the absence of nothing that is a big step forward.

From a grass roots level we see situations in a regional context that are significantly small. You are defining community as opposed to reacting to it so is that important? That's the question do you want to have some sort of say over long term development of the region as opposed to say over the development of 21 communities.

Is there a voluntary commitment to a larger scale consideration?
On safe issues yes. On difficult ones no. An example of a safe issue is the transportation plan. We already agreed to the provincial plan and provincial funding is contingent on this. A difficult issue is sprawl.

Is there a recognition that sprawl exists?
We are efficient in terms of density, but leap frog developments are an issue.

The vacuum that I see here is there is very limited provincial interest. There is no push from the province.

If the province had pushed – would the municipalities have been receptive?
It depends on how it was presented. If it was done collaboratively, yes. The vacuum leads to assumptions about what the outlook could be.

Edmonton needs to be a successful citystate. If it is not doing well, Spruce Grove (the surrounding regions) suffers.

What about issues of social equity – should it be a local or regional concern?
Sharing makes sense under clearly defined parameters. For example, the International Airport revenue goes to the county and the city – airport has responsibilities to both entities. Libraries are the same thing – the Province legislates libraries, funds part of it, municipalities run the libraries.

Growth Management could be successful if it comes from the Province and from municipalities both.

Where we are going in this current process?
If there is no provincial guidance, we can talk about success but I really question whether or not it will be achieved. They will be talked about but they will not be dealt with. In the short term dialogue is good, but bad in the long term if nothing is done.

The mechanism to determine how that process is going to be laid out seems critical
A lot of cooperation has been achieved because the Province has been sitting there with a stick and saying if we move the stick you may not like the answer. This is working with the voluntary system in the present situation.

When you are talking about Growth Management there are four or five communities that don't even want to sit at the table because of the direct threat to their tax base. For example, Fort Saskatchewan gets eighty percent of their tax base from large industrial plants.

Leduc has struggled to develop industrial lands. Nisku needs upgrading of its infrastructure. Spruce Grove and Stony Plain have no industrial base but how do you explain to your constituents that the benefit is to a community 65 miles away but locally there is no direct benefit?

I would like to see constructive dialogue around the real issues.

What do we want to achieve – does our present governance allow us to do that? Is the reverse happening?
Yeah, planning and development is governed by 21 different communities. Ninety-nine percent of the region's land mass is being developed independently of other communities. Ultimately, does that make sense? Probably not. There should be some higher order that makes that decision.

The governance review is looking at service integration, Growth Management, etc. There is no common assessment around what the regional issues are. How do you bring higher order issues to the table if you can't get a collective decision to mandate it?
The fringe issue between communities is not being resolved. Take Spruce Grove and Stony Plain – they are two communities growing together sharing each other's facilities, shopping. There are lots of interrelationships but when we make decisions we each make them independently. There are some exceptions – we are talking about building a leisure facility together and sharing the costs.

In 20 years you are going to have trouble telling which is Spruce Grove and which is Stony Plain.

And there will be a five-minute drive to Edmonton.
The North Saskatchewan River is a critical resource for this region. The River Valley Alliance is a voluntary alliance but it has not been tested on the hard issues.

I am not critical of the Alberta Capital Region Alliance. It is a helluva a lot better than nothing.

We have a high level of democracy relative to population but applying a single solution to all issues doesn't mean that it is good for all areas.

Counties have always been a land bank for the urbans. If you got out of that do you want to go back there? No. This region will survive depending on how well it competes provincially, nationally, and globally. There needs to be a vision as to the regional direction. There needs to be provincial leadership. I'm not sure which is the answer voluntary or mandatory participation. They both have merits and drawbacks.

County of Strathcona

Talk about the history of Growth Management and regionalism in the area from your perspective.
Rick – I have been with the County for 20 years so I have a fair bit of experience with previous regional planning. The EMRPC had a regional zoning approach. Many municipalities found it an overly restrictive, micro management approach to Growth Management. There was concern about it. The commission before it that was folded was in the process of coming up with a new regional plan. It changed its approach but there were still issues associated with it for Strathcona County. There were restrictions on the growth of hamlets. There were restrictions on suburban municipalities relevant to the amount of growth that was to occur in the City of Edmonton. There were concerns around that. Generally, the county had difficulties with the planning commission approach from a number of

David Turner is Manager, Corporate Planning Secretariat. Mr. Turner is involved in intermunicipal affairs, community relations, general research, and public participation activities.

Gary Klassen is Manager, Planning and Development Review Services. Mr. Klassen's department is responsible for all commercial and residential development issues, long-term planning for development, real estate services, and inspections.

Rick Powell is the Deputy Commissioner, Community Development. Mr. Powell heads the Community Development Branch of municipal government, which includes seven departments.

perspectives, the predominance of Edmonton membership was an issue. More than Edmonton per se was the predominance of urban versus rural. The county had an urban vote and a rural vote. Other surrounding counties just had rural votes. There was a pretty strong feeling that there wasn't a level playing field between the urbans and the rurals back then. Since then the planning legislation has changed. We now view the playing field as more level. Rural municipalities are equal or have as much planning authority and autonomy as urban municipalities do. Not perceived as land banks for urban municipalities any more. I often think of Growth Management as a code word for controlling your neighbour's growth if you are in an urban municipality and your neighbour is rural you want to make sure that the way is clear for annexation and that there is land for urban growth.

The land use guidelines that are in place now have dealt with this issue. The annexation process has been changed to more of a negotiating, mediating process. We're certainly more comfortable than we were before. There is more room for discussion and dialogue.

In terms of those partnerships, will they develop and grow between say this county and Fort Saskatchewan?
Rick - There is an existing joint general municipal plan in place between the two – we are debating and meeting with them to see if it is still relevant. It was adopted in 1986. We still haven't sorted out all of the issues on this topic between the two municipalities.

What about taking this discussion to a larger area – regional development. Does this county have a role in doing that?
Gary – if you look at the various components of the region there is merit in having that discussion. A recent example is the transportation work that has been done and adopted in a regional concept. The Municipal Development Plans which are long range planning documents which we've all adopted, there has been a discussion in the region and we've all come to a common agreement on that. There are also mechanisms put into place for when boundaries come into question or are affected in some way, there is a process put into place for discussion with and among the municipalities affected. A lot of the discussion process has been done. There may be a few incremental adjustments made. For example with the City of Edmonton, we've both recently adopted Municipal Development Plans that are very long range planning documents. We've got mechanisms in place in case we want to discuss any issues.

How binding are these plans?
Gary – the plans are adopted by the municipalities and are agreed to by the municipalities. It's a statutory process. The Municipal Government Act has specific mechanisms in it to allow the

municipalities to go to the Province. An example is the concern between the City of Edmonton and the County of Sturgeon on a specific planning area. The City said no its not satisfied. The board asked for more detailed planning in that area. The outcome was to put an area structure plan together with representation by both communities.

Rick – In that sense it is binding. The plan would take the form of notification requirements for various types of land use that might be considered controversial. Typically, we notify them within a mile or two miles. It tends to be self policing. The board is always there to blow the whistle as well.

Gary – In the MGA it states which types of growth need to have both internal and external discussion and with whom.

Do those agreements tend to be single issue agreements?
Rick – they tend to be based on the Municipal Development Plans that each municipality is required to adopt within a specific timeline. It has worked reasonably well. What we would see as a regional approach – is to go a step further than dealing with our neighbours. We can come up with a picture of regional growth intentions. Each municipality should be asked on the basis of the next 3, 10 and 20 years what growth projection is likely, what areas are involved. Some sort of composite plan could be prepared on that basis. That would assist primarily major infrastructure, long term planning. Transportation is a great model from the standpoint of the map that they've pulled together. It's only a five-year plan. If you tied in land use to that and for water and sewer you would have a better look at the long-term implications. Going beyond that is of concern to us because it basically removes municipal autonomy.

Municipalities are the ones who suffer or benefit from the growth that they incur. If it is cost inefficient or environmentally or socially a problem they're the ones who suffer. They are the authors of their own fate. If you get into a controlling environment where the region is imposing something on you then essentially they are dictating your future for you economically, socially and environmentally. That is a negative thing. Politically it is something that would be hard to impose. It implies an extra jurisdictional control.

What about the notion that if the whole region collectively decides that they are going to look at issues of economic development and they ultimately share whatever revenues or costs that arise from infrastructure for example, the whole region benefits and the quality of life of the whole region or most of it is improved wouldn't there be a benefit to doing it?
Rick – I don't see a benefit. This municipality would not be one who would step up to share revenue. I don't know what would be achieved other than each of us being at each other's throats from the

standpoint of who is getting the better deal. This way you make your own bed and lie in it. That way you would blame your neighbour. The politics would get enormously complex. It would detract from the notion of autonomous municipalities. Even where there are single jurisdictions you don't see Growth Management being practiced. I think it is totally impractical. It is idealogy it is not reality. I would be surprised if you came up with any practicing model that is working really well.

If there happens to be a healthy region on a larger scale they are able to deal more competitively with the global market as opposed to if each jurisdiction is competing among themselves they then spend their energy inward.
Rick – I think that you can have a lot of regional cooperation and have a healthy region and still have autonomous municipalities. That is the best solution.

How do you define a healthy region?
Rick – It's a regional ecology in my opinion. It is everybody acting independently in their own interests but cooperating and addressing linkages that are there between them.

In terms of this county and the kind of administrative progression you try to implement, you have a Municipal Development Plan that looks ahead a number of years...
Rick – Growth Management is a lot more than land use planning. You get into a lot of other fields economic, life style, etc. In my opinion a lot of these things don't work at large scale.

Gary – We can still choose to promote the region on an economic development stage around the world and share the benefits of coming to this region, but provide them when they come here with variety and choice.

In what form does that take place?
Gary – Two initiatives the Alberta Capital Region Alliance and one by the Greater Edmonton Tourism Area.

It is those bodies who come up with what businesses to attract and what sorts of services t provide them with once they get here?
David – Some communities do this to accommodate certain forms of industries, there are other issues that need to be addressed.

Rick – My approach would be for each municipality to say, okay what kind of municipality do we want to be? Do we want to be a heavy industrial center?

What about levels of standards?
Gary – We accommodate certain kinds of growth issues such as environmental, separation distance between heavy industries, we know that part of the business very well.

What about another jurisdiction that wants to attract the same kind of business that you do but doesn't have those kinds of standards set up. Should there be a process in place?
Rick – The Province performs that role from an environmental standpoint.

Gary – Where the people would like to live and the environment they would like to be in. We have a number of hamlets – some are very efficiently serviced, but there might be different standards a particular character to them. How important some of these elements might be to other municipalities might be – are not really important for other areas and vice versa. We worked with the community's values and provided some of them.

What about the number of people who are employable and the number of jobs available in terms of commuting, etc.?
Gary – It was more of a bedroom community. There is a strong element of employment in the city of Edmonton. We're finding a tremendous amount of pressure for growth in home businesses, life style lends it self to some of these new employment avenues. We are seeing a lot of differences in employment projections from 20 years ago. Technology is very important in terms of infrastructure for people to be able to work.

Rick – Ideally you would want to be the place where all of the businesses are and none of the residences are. Projections for 20 year planning gets less accurate as you go along. We do quite accurate five-year planning.

David – The market place dictates the direction as well.

Gary – Family structure is changing and you see housing form in that direction. Municipalities age differently.

Rick – They want the best of urban and the best of rural – looking for urban services such as shopping, cinemas, arenas, etc. but also want the rural environment. We are looking at the possibility of creating another Sherwood Park with space between them to preserve the rural aspect. We can preserve agricultural land, etc with that approach.

It is almost like within the county you have a regional approach to what is happening in the county.
Gary – But we represent all of those constituents and are obligated to them.

What happens when you get beyond a certain size?
Rick – To be an efficient entity it is difficult to respond to your constituents when you reach a certain size.

David – You may also have difficulties dealing with environmental issues when you get to a certain size. We utilize environmental conservation easements here. As new development proceeds, we do a full environmental assessment to preserve a portion of the land.

Gary – Many developers have got on side and used it as a selling feature (urban rural blend).

David – There is a mechanism to encourage them to do this

What about sustainability?
Rick – Everybody has a different definition. Does it work for the long, long term (50 – 100 years)? We consider it in the back of our minds when we do long range planning.

Gary – We've gotten strong feedback from our community about preserving green spaces, etc.

David – During our Municipal Development Planning – 18,000 households received packages – from that we got a temperature for where the community values were.

Rick – This is where our concern about outside control comes in. If someone is imposing their values on you, your voice does not get heard.

What about the notion that everybody collectively comes to the table and you bring your success to the table and they can look at it as an example of how things are working?

Gary – I think that is presumptuous. We share any ideas that work. We can clearly learn from other people as well. This review has really opened up discussion between the partners.

Rick – Different people have different values.

City of St. Albert

What is St. Albert's approach to Growth Management and experience with planning and development?
Curtis - We have a good relationship with our neighbours Edmonton and Sturgeon County with regards to planning and development issues. That hasn't always been the case with Sturgeon County. We have challenged Sturgeon's Municipal Development Plan and its land use bylaw at the municipal government board in 1998. The new people in Sturgeon have worked hard at establishing a good

Curtis Cundy is the Director of Planning and Development for the City of St. Albert.

Larry Horncastle is the Director of Economic Development and Tourism for the City of St. Albert.

relationship with its neighbours. The three municipalities are working together to establish an alternative dispute resolution mechanism to help us deal with planning and other issues before they become issues.

With Sturgeon County we have also been working on an Intermunicipal Development Plan.

In terms of interjurisdictional planning issues, what do those cover to date in terms of your neighbours?
Curtis – Any amendments to their Municipal Development Plans, area structure and land use plans they refer to us for comment. We do the same with them. Those are documented in each of our Municipal Development Plans. They work very well and we have good relationships with the planning departments of each of those two municipalities.

What about things like service delivery?
Curtis – Essentially the way it works is that each one of the communities offers their own services and sets them up. There is sharing of information between each administration.

Does St. Albert set policies for their own jurisdiction?
Curtis – Each one of the municipalities has their own Municipal Development Plan and comes up with their own policies. They are referred to each of the other communities to have input on our documents.

There is a lot of connection with the utility services – the water and sewer commissions. That is all done through one board. Each community has their own seat on it.

In terms of a larger regional picture for how those infrastructures should be set out, is there some sort of collaboration for a master plan?
Curtis – Yes, each community is involved in the planning.

Is there sharing of information between the commissions?
Curtis – They are all separate but they operate together in terms of sharing right of ways and that sort of information.

What is St. Albert's perspective on Growth Management?
Curtis – St. Albert is a growing community. We grow at about 2.5% per year. We just completed City Plan, our Municipal Development Plan so we have a lot of information available. We found that we have 14 years of residential land remaining and in terms of industrial land we have an adequate supply left. In terms of commercial land we are facing a crunch. We have about four to six years of land left. We are talking to Sturgeon County to see if we can come up with some solutions in terms of offering land to Big Box operations.

Maybe it will be in Sturgeon; maybe it will be in St. Albert. Either way it will be of benefit to both communities.

We have upped the level of density in our development documents as well.

Has multiuse zoning come up?
Curtis - Yes we've been very active in terms of urban villages.

Larry – We've designated three sites in the city in terms of urban villages. So it is being looked at very seriously.

What about St. Albert's role in terms of the whole region and trying to come up with a Growth Management plan?
Curtis – Going back to what I was saying earlier about our relationship to Edmonton and Sturgeon we are very aware of what they are trying to accomplish and they know what we are trying to accomplish.

What about the larger region though?
Curtis – We would have some involvement with that in terms of the planning perspective within our immediate vicinity.

Larry – On an economic development basis, St. Albert was very much involved with the ACRA group. We also belong to Metro Edmonton Economic Development.

Are you able to deal with regional issues within these groups?
Larry – Yes. We are cooperating with our neighbours on a whole host of fronts where it makes sense for us to partner.

Curtis – Yes, all of the communities are involved. All of the commissions we're involved in have worked very well.

Any economic development officer I've ever spoken to certainly wants to see development within their area. But there are certain types of industries, like heavy industries that St. Albert has gone on record, as saying our policy is not wanting to pursue this. If someone were to come into the area, we would certainly help out in terms of having them go to Strathcona or some other area if it would be a benefit to the region.

But wouldn't it also be a benefit to your residents given that a lot of them work outside of St. Albert?
Curtis – Yes. We have a good amount of our residents who work and have businesses in Edmonton.

Larry – We are a community of choice. We want to be different and have industries that make sense for us and carve out our niche in that.

What about the role of the Province in regional development?
Curtis – In some ways you have to ask the provincial government that question. In terms of a planning perspective, the Province used to take the lead in terms of regional planning. They made a conscious choice to get out of that business in 1995.

I think they have a role in regional planning.

Larry – I think this city has done a good job in terms of planning. We have a long-range plan in place.

Curtis – We have emphasized the retaining of open spaces, the parks, and natural areas. Our Intermunicipal Development Plan with Sturgeon, we've been working out the issues between us and we're both quite happy with the plan.

George Cuff

George Cuff is a former mayor of Spruce Grove.

My quick bias is all of this stuff goes back years. They don't realize that we're facing history but we're also facing some of the same players that were part of that history. There are people that are still around and some in positions of influence that have had an influence on all of this. What they remember is that the relations with the City of Edmonton have never been very good which in part is simple a factor of who they are and their size and the small size of everybody else. They have also exercised more than their clout in the past particularly with the water and sewer commissions which were spread up around the City of Edmonton. They really came into being because people couldn't cooperate with the City of Edmonton who was trying to control growth as a result of controlling access to water. If you're living in Spruce Grove or Stony Plain or Morinville people were quite ticked. Edmonton quickly became the bad boy on the block. That's a part of the backdrop.

The second part of the backdrop deals with the issues around annexation. Again Edmonton took a heavy hand and tried to suggest to everybody that the world would work a lot better if we looked at annexation. That impacted probably more so Strathcona County and St. Albert and part of Leduc. Those are issues at the time.

The other issue at the time is in regard to the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission which eventually died along with all of the other regional planning commissions when Steve West and company canned them. Again the relationship there was not really healthy. Almost regardless of who they had on it. It wasn't so much a factor of who the individuals were it was that people thought Edmonton was trying to be heavy handed in its control of planning issues. They wanted not only control of what people would think would be a reasonable area around their own city, they wanted control of everybody else's growth as well. Their idea of regional planning and regional growth would be that everything that makes

sense to us and was valuable to the city would come into the city and anything that we didn't want we would allow to go into the hinter land. The hinterland didn't respond very well to that.

So in other words, that that was regional was really that that was best for Edmonton.
Right. Beauty was in the eye of the beholder. Again, that to really skims over the history. We had countless meetings. I set up something called the Edmonton regional Mayors' Committee we had everybody on board. Eventually we decided we should all cooperate so we set up something that included Edmonton. That was only toward the end of my tenure which ended in 1989. So around 1985-89 we had this regional mayors committee. I was Chair and Laurence Decore was Vice Chair. Things improved but it didn't matter who is there whether it is Laurence Decore or Bill Smith.

It really is a question of how big is Edmonton and what is their agenda and does it match ours. Of course from an Edmonton point of view which I could equally argue is if we are this large should we really go to the table with anybody who has the same number of votes that we do. For Edmonton it doesn't make any sense. There is a lot of angst in regard to Edmonton and its role in this thing. What you are going to run into is a lot of people who say forget it we're not interested and the rest of it.

So you're saying they are just going to reach the common ground of service delivery and that's going to be it?
Yes. For example it would be nice to think that you could regionalize other kinds of services including the service around economic development but it just doesn't make sense.

Why?
Because you'd all say let's go after a particular industry in the Edmonton area. And the first time it came to the Edmonton area and landed in Edmonton all of the councillors from the surrounding area would say that doesn't make sense all we're doing is supporting the City of Edmonton.

What if there was a revenue sharing mechanism?
Then perhaps it would work.

And then associated with the cost of that would be a sharing of the cost of the infrastructure as well.
That's a possibility and if you built in something that people would agree would allow them to not have these concerns relative to who has the upper leg then fine. What Edmonton would say is we'll do our best. The first meeting would go swimmingly provided there was no real issue on the floor. As soon as a business expressed interest in coming to Edmonton, I could phone three different mayors and they would all be scrambling to see who got the business regardless of what agreement you had.

Just because we have that history.
Partly that and partly the fact that you have councillors getting elected on the basis of Elect me and I'll help my community grow. The way we're going to grow is to attract new industry. As soon as they found out that I was endorsing the industry to go to Stony Plain instead of Spruce Grove they would want to lynch me. That would be the response.

So do you see some sort of regional cooperation not working just as a voluntary organization between the municipalities? Do you think there needs to be somebody overseeing it all in some form?
At the moment there is probably not enough taste for that. If you had some sort of panel that could draw people together and could oversee issues regionally and make regional recommendations to everybody else that probably would work a lot better. But if you came up with something that smelled of another level of government you would not be well received.

Why is that? Is it because of the economics attached to it?
Pure economics at the moment.

There are areas that you could sit down and say the communities could share and do things a whole lot more efficiently. I think the public needs to know that there things that could be done more efficiently. For example, you don't need 12 water commissions around the City of Edmonton doing essentially the same thing all paying honoraria and staff salary. There are some things that are positive that could come out of it.